

THE
MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1859.

ART. I.—RELIGION AND CHRISTIANITY.

CHRISTIANITY may be called the religion of Jesus Christ ; or the *true* religion, all the religions of the world being regarded as false. Using the terms in such relation to each other, we imply both a difference and a connection between the objects which they name ; a difference, however, which holds between a genus and one of the species belonging to it, and a connection which consists in the possession of elements common to both. Religion is the general term and applicable to Buddhism, Parseeism, or Mohammedanism with as much propriety as to Christianity ; each system is a religion ; whilst Christianity is a particular term designating the system of truth revealed in Jesus Christ, and none other. Christianity is *a* religion ; but because the only true one, it is called by way of emphasis *the* religion. Or, to use a logical expression, we may say, according to this view of their difference, that religion is the more *extensive* and Christianity the more *intensive* term ; the one applying to all systems no matter what be their character, and the other to but one system which includes the truth and excludes the errors of all, and besides contains what no other system does or can contain.

This view of the relation of religion to Christianity, considering the general subject scientifically, we deem insufficient. It fails to recognize the essential nature of Christianity as something unique—as something which is not shared by any Pagan system, nor even by Judaism. It seems also to overlook the fact, that all the religions of the

world taken together constitute a class. They are all developed from the same principle active in the heart of mankind, and possess common and essential characteristics; a principle and characteristics which do not enter into the constitution of Christianity. We think that Christianity differs from religion, or from all the religions of the world, not specifically, nor in degree, but generically or in kind. There must be a generic difference between the opposing systems.

This generic difference we shall endeavor to unfold; but in order to prepare the way for it, we propose, in the first place, to review the distinctions which arise on what we regard as the insufficient principle of difference.

The first and most common distinction relates to their origin. Pagan systems are the religions of nature, or *natural* religion, but Christianity is a *revealed* religion. The one is derived from reflection on the natural world; the other is established by divine revelation. This distinction, however, proceeds on the assumption that the constitution of nature and supernatural revelation are opposites. It implies that nature is not a certain revelation of God, and that the supernatural revelation of Christ is given independently of the natural world; an assumption that can certainly not stand the test of criticism. There is no such opposition. The two things do not exclude but include each other.

Nature itself is a certain revelation of the existence and majesty of God; so certain that all men possess the fundamental truth without any knowledge of Christ; so certain that neither the Old nor the New Testament formally teach it. The first book of Genesis opens with: "In the beginning God created the Heaven and the Earth;" and proceeds throughout, like every other book of the Sacred Scriptures in the same spirit; thus assuming the principle that belief in the Majesty of God is certainly at hand in the minds of all to whom they are addressed. They teach clearly what He is, what His will is, what He has done, is doing and will do; but not that He is. This fact na-

ture reveals with irresistible authority ; so authoritatively that they deal at once with a pretended atheist as a wicked man : "The fool has said in his heart, there is no God." (Ps. 14: 1.)

The revelation of nature is immediate. The knowledge of God it affords is not obtained only from logical reflection on it, or from scientific study, as if the scholar alone could acquire it ; but it arises directly from the constitution of things, so that all classes of men possess it, however ignorant they may be in all other respects. The heavens declare the glory of God ; and the firmament showeth His handy-work. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night showeth knowledge. There is no speech nor language where their voice is not heard. (Ps. 19: 1-3.) The external world says to every human being: God is, and God is great.

Not only the external world but man also is a revelation of God. Man makes God known to himself. Not that he does this at will or merely by thinking on himself, his body, soul and spirit, or on his manifold relations ; but the knowledge of God is developed directly in his consciousness. Whenever the development of his rational being goes forward normally the idea of God arises in his mind immediately. It springs from himself, or, as Mansel expresses it, "We are compelled by the constitution of our minds to believe in the existence of an Absolute and Infinite Being,—a belief which appears forced upon us, as the complement of our consciousness of the relative and finite."* The same thing is taught by the Apostle Paul. Speaking of the state of the heathen, he says ; "That which may be known of God is manifest in them ; for God hath showed it unto them." (Rom. 2: 19.) That which may be known of God is His eternal power and Godhead ; and this is manifest in the heathen. Their idea and views of God they get from the visible creation and from themselves. In other words, they and the world are a natural revelation

of God, a revelation so certain and satisfactory, as far as it goes, that humanity neither needs nor demands corroboration of its great truths from any other source.

It follows that the religions of the world rest on a revelation as really as Christianity; and we can not say, religion is natural, but Christianity revealed. Both are revealed; the one in nature, the other in Christ. Nature and revelation are then not contradictory opposites; and Christianity does not differ from religion in being a certain and authoritative revelation of God. Religion is the same. But the two systems differ as to the matter revealed. That which Christianity is and reveals, is generically different from that which nature reveals in all systems of religion. And just because the revelation of God in the external world and in man is so authoritative and indestructible does there exist the deepest and an intensely painful necessity in the fallen, sinful, helpless subject of religion for that higher and more glorious and truly satisfying revelation which has been accomplished in Christianity.

But as nature does not exclude revelation, so neither does revelation exclude nature. The distinction we are reviewing seems to divorce in thought the things which are in reality connected. It divorces nature from revelation. This we have shown to be an error; for the constitution of nature is a true revelation. So it divorces revelation from nature. It seems to regard revelation and especially the Christian Revelation as an act of Almighty God done independently of the order of the natural world. This is undoubtedly an error also. Christianity is a revelation in and through nature much more really than any system the world has ever produced. Indeed all revelation of divine, invisible and eternal things adapted to man's rational being is possible only in as far as it addresses him in natural and finite forms. For though man unfolds from himself an idea of God and of an unchangeable relation to Him, and is endowed with the capacity of living communion with the Invisible and Eternal, he is nevertheless a finite being; he lives in finite relations; and must think in finite

categories of thought. He can not rise in modes of thought above the sphere of existence to which he belongs. When he thinks of God he must do it in a human way. Above nature, therefore, or in supernatural and super-human forms God can not address man; and never has done it. Could we believe such an act possible it would accomplish no conceivable purpose. Remaining in a sphere of manifestation which is above and outside of the constitution of nature, the Divine Being would be totally separated from man and continue to be the Unknown One. To become known He must cease to be thus totally separated from him and draw near in a way which is congenial to human being. He must manifest Himself not in a form foreign to man, but in the very form in which the laws of his rational constitution require man to think and to know.

This is the very idea which meets us in the Christian revelation. It runs through all its preparatory stages as recorded in the Old Testament. God speaks to man in human language and in modes of conception which prevail in a particular age of the world, in a particular country and among a particular people. He manifests Himself in dreams and visions. He exhibits His supernatural power and majesty in wonderful deeds wrought by His commissioned servants before the eyes of the people. He represents His personal glory by a visible symbol, the mysterious cloud dwelling on the mercy-seat between the cherubim. The import and relations of the great promise, which, first uttered in Eden, develops itself in ever-increasing fulness during four thousand years like the life of the mustard-seed in the growth of the tree, He teaches in civil regulations, in outward rites, in special ordinances and bloody sacrifices, which were observed from day to day for a period of fifteen hundred years.

All these forms of divine revelation were outward, visible, tangible, real. They were derived from every department of the natural world, from the mineral, vegetable and animal kingdoms; from man himself, from his birth, stages of growth, maturity and death; from social and civil relations,

and from the entire sphere of his natural life. The virgin of truth came to men from Heaven, not irradiated with the pure, infinite halo of uncreated glory, but robed in the most simple yet most beautiful garments and adorned with the richest jewelry of earth. Nor was this mode of approach arbitrary or accidental. It was not a temporary accommodation to human ignorance and weakness. But, on the principle just stated, it was necessary. It was imperatively demanded by the entire constitution of humanity; and, were the Old Testament dispensation not completed in Christ, would be as necessary now, if God would reveal Himself, as it was then.

The Old Testament dispensation foreshadowed our Lord Jesus Christ, was preparatory to His coming and became complete in Him. He was the last and most perfect revelation of God. Answering to, transcending and completing all previous modes of divine manifestation, He took the place of them, and thus they were abolished in Him. But in perfecting and consummating the revelation of Himself in the person of Christ, God did not abrogate the principle on which all previous revelations had been made. He did not cease to manifest Himself in natural forms; but this mode of manifestation was developed to the highest possible degree of perfection. Before, His relation to nature was rather external and transient. God at sundry times and in divers manners spake unto the fathers by the prophets; (Heb. 1: 1). He showed His great power in plagues, in the division of the Red Sea, in thunderings and lightnings, in the overthrow of the Canaanites, and so on; but He did not become Moses or Elijah; He did not transform Himself into thunder or lightning, nor into the visible Shekinah. Now, however, in Christ His relation to nature becomes internal and permanent. He is not in man as He was in Moses; He does not only speak and work through man, as he did through Elijah; but God becomes man. -God is united to man. God and man do not indeed become identical, yet they become really and eternally one. The Word *was made flesh* and dwelt among

us, the Apostle John informs us. God sent "his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh." (Rom. 8: 3.) Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He who is the brightness of God's glory and the express image of His person and upholds all things by the word of His power, Himself likewise took part of the same. He took not on Him the nature of angels but He took on Him the seed of Abraham. (Heb. 2: 14-16.) Without controversy, therefore, great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest, or manifested, in the flesh. (1 Tim. 3: 16.) The word *flesh* denotes humanity, or human nature. Man as the head of the natural world is the most perfect embodiment of its idea and laws, and is consequently in living connection and sympathy with its lower orders and forms of existence. In the broadest and most literal sense, therefore, is the manifestation of God in man, according to the unequivocal teachings of the New Testament, the revelation of the supernatural in the natural, of the infinite in the finite, of the absolute in the relative, of the invisible in the visible, of eternity in time. Human nature the Son of God assumed into organic union with Himself, and thus it, that is, man himself becomes the concrete form under which God reveals Himself to man. That which is above and beyond all modes of human conception and all the categories of human thinking, approaches man under these limited modes of conception and categories of thinking—addresses him conformably to all the demands of his sensuo-rational nature—and is in consequence revealed to him. The unknown becomes known by assuming the form of that which both knows and is known.

The assumed antithesis between natural and revealed religion is therefore not valid. Nature, or the physical creation, is indeed not the only, much less a sufficient revelation of God; and the supernatural order of revelation reveals what is infinitely different from the teachings of the natural world. Yet the natural world is a form of undoubted revelation of divine and invisible things; and on the other hand, the highest revelation of God, was made in its

preparatory stages in outward natural forms, and consummated at last in the physico-rational constitution of humanity. The natural reveals the supernatural; and the supernatural can reveal itself in no way but through the medium of the natural. Hence the antithetical relation in which nature is set to revelation affords no valid basis for a scientific distinction between the religions of the world and Christianity.

We proceed to consider another received distinction. The religions of the world are said to be *false*, but Christianity is the *true* religion. Though valid in some respects, yet we can not regard the antithesis as expressing a correct conception of the reciprocal relation of the two systems. Christianity is indeed the truth emphatically. Christ is the revelation of God and of man; the real Mediator between both; the only One who can take away sin in its root and its consequences and the only Regenerator and Restorer to all its normal relations of fallen humanity. He is complemental to and actually satisfies all the demands, whether known or unknown, of the entire man. In this respect no religion can compare with Christianity. But it does not follow from the exclusive claim of Christ to being the real Saviour of mankind, that the insufficient religions of the world are entirely false—that they contain no truth, but are systems of unmingled error. The presumption is in favor of the contrary judgment, that there is truth also in every religion, even in the very lowest system of Paganism; otherwise there would be no subjective basis for Christianity. There would be no point of contact between the God-man, Jesus Christ, and degenerate, ignorant and miserable men—no capacity to appreciate, or be awakened even to a dark sense of the significance of His person and work. There would be no principle in the Pagan mind and character of which Christianity could lay hold in order to develop a purer consciousness and a higher order of human life.

This presumption is fully sustained by the religious history of the world. Every system of religion is based upon

and incorporates certain primary elements of undoubted truth. The first of all, which is fundamental to every other, is the idea of a Supreme Being. There is a God, is the spontaneous utterance of the human heart. What God is, man can not determine; hence the prevailing notion of His being may be very crude, low and degrading, for it will always be modified by the peculiar character of a people; but the belief that He exists, is the principle which lies at the bottom of every system of religion and pervades the entire consciousness of mankind. It is the first and deepest of all truths. Springing directly from it, is the sense and perception of a real but mysterious relation between God and man; and this felt relation gives rise necessarily to several ruling cognate ideas, namely, the idea of right and wrong; the idea of a state of sin or moral evil; of worship, or of the propriety of some mode or form of communion with Deity; of a future state of existence; and of the necessity of some means of restoring man to the favor and fellowship of God. With more or less clearness and fulness every Pagan religion embodies these ideas as its essential elements. In one religion, one idea becomes the ruling element to which the others are held subordinate; in another religion, it is some other idea which gives character to the system; so that the truth which is the fundamental principle in one developed system, holds a subordinate place in another; and the reverse. Thus there have originated as many systems, or different kinds, of religion as there are intuitive truths which the perverted human reason has taken for the fundamental principle. Considered as systems of salvation, therefore, these religions are all false; yet the principles from which they spring are great truths. They are false because the particular truth taken as a principle is not *the* principle of a system that can save men. The principle is a truth, but the truth is a false principle; and because false, there is no saving power in the system, nor in any truths which the system embraces. The incorporated truth itself is perverted by error of principle and becomes the occasion of deeper degradation and

misery. The fundamental idea of Mohammedanism, for example, is a great truth, namely, that *God is one God*—monotheism in opposition to polytheism—but this great truth is not the principle of the true system, of a system that can deliver men from the power and guilt of sin and restore them to holy fellowship with God. No fallen man is saved because he believes in one God, worships Him according to the dictates of his conscience and seeks earnestly to conform to all His known requirements. All who believe in Christianity must regard salvation as flowing from a very different source.—Any other religion of man would serve to illustrate the same important distinction.

Christianity, on the other hand, does not only contain truth, but it rests also in a true principle. It is determined in its entire order by a truth which is really fundamental to all other truths; a truth which is the principle of all other principles; a truth which presupposes the truths of religion and includes them, and so includes them that they become integral parts of a sublime whole. Holding such a relation in Christianity to a true principle, the truths of religion acquire supernatural vitality; and possess power to bring man to that state of spiritual blessedness, which, in all ages, though in possession of these same truths, but not in possession of the transforming power of the true principle, he has struggled in vain to reach.

Adopting this view of the primary elements of religion, it becomes evident that we can not distinguish properly between it and Christianity, by calling the one false and the other true. These primary elements being primary truths which are at hand in man as the subjective basis of Christianity, and which are taken up into it, the distinction does wrong in two directions. It deals a blow of death to the left and to the right. It does wrong to religion and to man. For it turns the universal belief in Deity into a lie, the universal idea of the morally right and the morally wrong into a shadow; and the universal tendency and sense of obligation to worship, or hold communion with a Power above man, into superstition. It does wrong too

to Christianity and to God. For the revelation of God in Christ proceeds at every point on the presumption that man's belief in God and in a mysterious relation of man to God is true, and that his religious wants and tendencies are a most solemn reality. If this presumption of the Sacred Scriptures be regarded as false, Christianity stands chargeable with a great mistake, a mistake that is incompatible with its claim to the unreserved confidence of mankind.

There is another distinction between religion and Christianity which we deem insufficient. The religions of the world are many, Christianity is one. Each religion is sectional, suited to the peculiar temperament, character and habits of a particular race or nation, whilst Christianity is suited alike to all races and all nations. Christianity is, therefore, a religion for the world, or the *world-religion*, but any other religious system is not.

In this distinction there is some propriety, yet it does not afford a correct conception of the difference. Christianity is indeed adapted to the deepest wants of all nations and kindreds and tongues alike. It is adapted to human ignorance, to human guilt and human misery; for it pours a flood of pure light from heaven into the darkened understanding; it purges the conscience from dead works to serve the living God; it awakens the dead in sin to a new life of faith in Christ Jesus; it sustains and develops that new life in its conflict with sin and the powers of darkness; and it produces peace in the heart, order in society and harmony between the races and nations of the world. These essential tendencies of its nature satisfy the painful yearnings of the human spirit in life and in death; and with equal freshness and power in all cases, without regard to sex, age, periods of history, climate or nationality. Christianity is for *man* unconditionally. No other system sustains such a relation to him. None other is adapted to and satisfies the wants of the world. So far forth this distinction between Christianity and religion is correct. The contents of the one positively meet the demand of the whole world, those of the other do not.

But the distinction is not correct if it imply that, though not adapted to the whole world, some systems of religion, as distinguished from Christianity, are nevertheless positively suited to a particular age of the world—to a particular race or nation; as if the difference consisted merely in a greater or less extensive adaptation to the wants of mankind. Each religion, it is thought, may suit a particular nation, but Christianity suits all nations. Such an implication is not valid. Religion or any non-Christian system, is not only not adapted to the *whole* world, but, in the sense in which the objective contents of Christianity meet the actual demands of humanity, it is not even adapted to any one age or nation. Every religion fails of its end. Mohammedanism satisfies the moral and religious nature of the Turk or Arab as little as it can that of the Swiss or the Germans. Brahminism can satisfy the Hindoos as little as it could Englishmen or Frenchmen.

There is a sense, however, we readily admit, in which a religion is suited or adapted to the people who embrace it. Mohammedanism, as a system, was shaped by the general intellectual, religious and political status of the East during the sixth and seventh centuries, as well as by the genius and ambition of Mohammed; hence there is a certain original sympathy or congeniality between the religion of Mohammed and the character of his followers; and we may accordingly speak of the one as being adapted to the other. So too may we speak of the adaptation of Brahminism to the Hindoos. Brahminism is the outgrowth of the thoughtful, contemplative character of the ancient Hindoo, and in consequence bears the impress of his own mind and spirit. The doctrines of the Vedas, the division of society into castes, and all the religious customs and forms of worship, constitute the spiritual element in which he lives and moves with freedom. The character of the Hindoo answers to his religion, and his religion answers to him. Hence we may speak of a correspondence between Brahminism and the Hindoos, that does not exist between Parseeism or Mohammedanism and the Hindoos; and that

does not exist either between Brahminism and the character of the roving hordes on the desert plains of Arabia. Brahminism is not a congenial element for the followers of Mohammed; nor is Mohammedanism a congenial element for the worshippers of the Hindoo triad, Brahma, Vishnu and Siva, the Creator, Preserver and Destroyer. It is true that "a considerable number of the Hindoo race were converted to this faith, and profess it to this day. But it could take no hold of the heart of the people, for it solved no difficulty which was perplexing them; it affirmed a truth which staggered them, and before which they bowed; one, however, which in this form coalesced with scarcely any conditions of their intellectual or of their moral being."* The religions are dissimilar, because the people are dissimilar from whom the religions originated.

Such correspondence, however, between a people and their religion is very different in kind from the adaptation of Christianity to every age and nation. A religion being the spontaneous product of a people, it can not be different from the general mind of the people; nor can it be higher or better than they are. It is but the spiritual image of their own mysterious inner being. The correspondence is consequently purely subjective. The relation is not that of an external, independent, objective reality, corresponding positively to the demands of a dependent subject. But it is the relation of a subject to the unsubstantial reflection of itself. A religion is suited to a people as a dream is to a man. A farmer dreams of his waving grain; a merchant of his purchases and sales; a soldier of the battle-field; a philosopher of his abstruse speculations; and a traveller in a strange land of the endearments of his far-off home. The dreams of each are suitable to his condition; and those of the one can not be substituted for those of the other. Each one projecting his own habit of life is confronted by the image of himself, and with this he is in direct sympathy. But these projections of the imagination can not satisfy.

* *The Religions of the World by Maurice.* p. 77.

The image of a table covered with meats, bread and fruits, may delight the heart of a poor hungry beggar sleeping by the wayside; but it does not stop the cravings of hunger; and he wakes up to a keener sense of his poverty and woe. So does Brahminism correspond to the character of the Hindoo; but as the object of his adoration is not the true God and Saviour, but only his idea of God invested with the mysterious qualities and relations of his own spiritual nature, it possesses no objective power for the Hindoo—no power essentially different from himself to deliver him from the bondage of evil and infuse new life into his heart.

The adaptation, on the contrary, of Christianity to the wants of the world is objective and positive. Christianity is a spiritual reality outside of man and essentially different from him, which derives its nature and attributes neither from the genius of an individual nor from the character of a nation, but from the constitution of a Person who of God is made unto men wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption. It answers to the heart of man, not as face answers to face in a looking-glass, nor as a dream of a feast answers to the painful gnawings of hunger; but as the light of the rising sun answers to the waking eye, as the harmonies of music answer to the listening ear, as a loaf of good bread answers to the cravings of a famishing beggar, or as a spring of sparkling water answers to the thirst of a way-worn traveller. The light of the sun, a loaf of bread and fresh water are so many veritable objects in the external world whose positive qualities correspond to, and when appropriated, actually satisfy men's natural wants. So is Christianity a veritable spiritual object, a new creation in Christ Jesus, whose positive elements and power flowing from Him are adapted to all the wants of individuals and of the world, whether spiritual, moral, intellectual, physical or social, and when appropriated by a true faith remove these wants according to the law of its own life and raise man to a state of inward, real and satisfying fellowship with God. Such positive adaptation differs as widely from the congeniality of a religion with the

character of a people, as the adaptation of a running stream in the desert to a weary caravan differs from that of the deceitful mirage. Religion is in fact not adapted at all to any actual wants of a people. The contents of the system possess no objective reality, and serve therefore only to intensify and mock the deepest yearnings of the spirit.

To distinguish between religion and Christianity by calling one a national or sectional religion and the other the world-religion involves, as we think, another error of a different kind. We have considered this distinction as it affects and does a wrong to Christianity, implying that its positive suitableness to mankind is shared by religion, only less extensively, and thus overlooking the essential difference between the two systems. We must consider the distinction also as it affects and does a wrong to religion, implying that religion is less extensive in its adaptation to mankind than Christianity. This assumption is certainly erroneous; for it can be shown that religion is as broad as Christianity. If we consider the actual condition of Christianity in the world, we may say even that religion is broader; for under one or another of its numerous forms it belongs to or must be predicated of all nations, whilst, to say the most, Christianity has as yet become the faith of not more than one-third of the human family.

That religion is as broad as Christianity becomes evident from a consideration of the relation which the many and various systems of religion sustain to each other. They spring, not from similar principles, but from one and the same fundamental principle from which are developed the same primary elements in all. These systems are different, it is true, because they start in different primary truths, as we have already endeavored to show; which truths operate as so many different principles, each giving rise to a particular system possessing characteristics peculiar to itself. But these particular principles are grounded in a deeper and broader one which is common to them all; for this one deepest principle, which we call fundamental, is lodged not only in some individuals, or some nations, or some

racés, to the exclusion of others, but it is an essential attribute of humanity as such, irrespective of the difference of nationalities or races. It is the subjective idea of a Supreme Being, which is developed in man, with the normal development of his rational nature, as an immediate fact of consciousness. Subjective we call it, not because the idea is in the subject, man, or belongs to him, but because the informing power of the idea is in man. It originates from him and its contents are determined by him. The idea is neither more nor less, as to form and matter, than the fallen constitution of man makes it in the ordinary process of development. As this idea, from which are derived the subordinate ideas of dependence, of obligation, of right and wrong, of guilt, of mediation and worship, is the fundamental principle of all religions, and as it belongs to humanity as a whole, two things must be regarded as true. The one, that the many religions of the world, however they may differ, constitute in reality but one religion; each being a particular development of the same first principle and incorporating the same essential elements under a modified form. The other, that religion is as extensive as humanity, there being no race or nation on the face of the globe which is destitute of it. Religion belongs to the world. It is world religion as really as Christianity, the one being the general expression and embodiment of the world's deepest needs, the other the expression and embodiment of the positive grace of Almighty God adapted to and designed for the real satisfaction of these universal needs.

Religions are analogous to races. There are many races, that is, permanent modifications of body and mind perpetuated by natural generation, yet but *one* human race—but one humanity; because every individual, as well as each particular race, possesses that sensuo-rational life and those essential qualities in virtue of which a being is a man, and is distinguished from every other class of beings.

Religions are analogous also to languages. There are innumerable languages and dialects. Each one has an

etymology, a syntactical arrangement, an idiom, and a pronunciation, which is peculiar to itself. Hence they differ, and some of them very much; as much so as any two religions which are most unlike each other. Yet the principle which underlies languages and determines the general structure of each, is the same in all. The categories of thought which they embody, and the general laws by which they are governed, are identical. That, in a word, in virtue of which a form of articulation is human speech, is common alike to all. Whilst, therefore, there are many forms of human speech, there is at bottom but one language. A sound philosophy of one language is a sound philosophy of all languages.

The religions of the world stand related to religion as such, as the nationalities and races stand related to humanity, or as the dialects and languages do to language. On the one side we have particular forms of expression, each form possessing its own distinctive characteristics. On the other we have a principle, a life, a law of life, from which the particular forms are developed, and from which they derive a common fundamental character. In these respects humanity, language and religion are alike. The Circassian race is a particular form of humanity; Latin a particular form of language; and Buddhism a particular form of religion. On the other hand, there is but one humanity in the world; and, philosophically considered, but one language and but one religion. The three things are likewise equally extensive. Where there is a mature human being, there is some form of speech and some form of religion.

Broader, then, or more comprehensive than religion is, Christianity, in its relation to man, can not be. Indeed religion, in the nature of the case, must always precede Christianity in the order of time, as an indispensable condition of its extension. He only can be made a partaker of Christ and His benefits who possesses a religious nature. Could we conceive of a man without religion, or without any religious ideas, wants and instincts, he would be one who would be incapable of becoming a Christian; Christi-

anity would not be adapted to him. So far from Christianity being adapted to the world whilst religion is not, the truth is that Christianity is thus adapted to the wants of the world just because the whole world is religious.

Before we proceed to enquire more directly into the difference between religion and Christianity, we will yet consider one other distinction which we can not but regard as insufficient. It is that Christianity is a religion of the Spirit of God, whilst all other systems are not of the Spirit, but purely of the flesh.

We do not for a moment think of denying that the Holy Ghost, poured out according to the word of Christ on the day of Pentecost upon the assembled disciples under the miraculous form of a "rushing mighty wind" and "cloven tongues as of fire," proceeded from the Father and the Son, and has continued to abide among His people from that day to this, and will abide among them down to the end of time. Nor do we deny that the presence and operation of the Spirit as connected with and proceeding from Jesus Christ is the only saving operation upon the hearts of sinful men. The Spirit of Christ alone can regenerate, sanctify and glorify by establishing and sustaining a vital union of men to the glorious Person of the God-man.

But the Sacred Scriptures require us to deny that the saving operation of the Spirit is His only operation upon the hearts of men; or that His presence and influence in the world is confined within the sphere of Christianity, and that consequently the entire non-Christian world is, and has always been, excluded from the influences of the Spirit. The Scriptures teach just the opposite. The Holy Ghost operates even upon the natural or material world. It was He who in the beginning brought forth the order and beauty of the heavens and earth from a shapeless, chaotic mass of matter. "And the earth was without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep; and the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." (Gen. 1: 2.) The original word *ruahh* does indeed denote properly *breath* or *wind*; but from the constitution of human nature the

name of a supersensible object is always derived from, or suggested by, a sensible one on the principle of resemblance or analogy between them. It is so here. The word designates the Spirit of God. So it was understood and rendered by the English Translators. So it is interpreted also by the most trustworthy commentators. The passage teaches accordingly that as the eagle spreads her wings over her young, warming and protecting them and unfolding their young lives into mature and complete form, so did God by His Spirit operate upon, and in, chaotic matter to produce the present order of the world. This sense is clearly sustained by other passages. "By his *spirit* he hath garnished the heavens." (Job 26: 13.) "By the word of the Lord were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the breath (*ruahh*) of his mouth." (Ps. 33: 6.) "Thou sendest forth thy spirit (*ruahh*), they are created; and thou renewest the face of the earth." (Ps. 104: 30.) From these and other passages of Scripture we must infer that God by His Spirit is present and active in the material world, not pantheistically or as being identified with its life, yet really as Creator and Preserver ever maintaining its constitution and renewing the diversified forms of its existence.

If present in the material world, how much more so in the human kingdom where the import of all lower orders of existence gains its highest expression. The presumption certainly is that the Spirit of God operates upon mankind in general no less than upon matter. We are not left, however, to the resources of our own judgment. The Bible abounds with hints on the subject. When the wickedness of the world became so great that God determined to destroy the entire race, (Noah and his family excepted,) He said "My Spirit shall not always strive with man." "Man" must denote the antediluvian world. God willed that his Spirit should no longer contend, in temporal judgments and in the utterances of the conscience, against the strong disposition of the race to do evil—a disposition which like a mighty current bore away every obstacle to

its progress. This of course implies that up to that time the Spirit had been with sinful man striving in him against evil. By way of confirmation compare 1 Peter 3: 18-20.

It is stated in the Book of Numbers that when the children of Israel had conquered the Amorites and pitched in the plains of Moab, Balak, the king of the Moabites, sent messengers to Balaam, entreating him to come and curse the Israelites; for they were too mighty for him. (Num. 22-24.) Then follows an interesting account of the conduct of Balaam, the whole of which illustrates the special communications of God to the mind of a man who did not belong to the chosen nation. It is stated expressly that "the Spirit of God came upon" Balaam; "and he took up his parable, and said," &c. (Num. 24: 2.)

Passing by other similar instances, occurring in the Old Testament, of the Spirit's directly influencing the minds of men outside of the Jewish Church, we will examine one or two of the declarations of the New. In his discourse to the Athenians delivered on Mar's Hill, the Apostle Paul uses the following language: God "hath made of one blood all nations of men, for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation: that they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him, and find him, though *he be not far from every one of us*: for in him we live and move and have our being; as certain also of your own poets have said, For we are also his offspring." (Acts 17: 26-28.) The Apostle teaches that there is an important sense in which God governs the heathen, and is with them (by His Spirit,) begetting a deep sense of the vanity and misery of the world and exciting a disposition to seek Him, in whom they live, and move and have their being. Under such influences the heathen poet, Aratus, utters the sentiment: "For we are all His offspring," which the Apostle embodies in his discourse as a truth of God.

Another apposite passage occurs in his Epistle to the Romans. "The wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men who hold the

truth in unrighteousness. Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath revealed it unto them. For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse. Because that when they knew God, they glorified him, not as God, neither were thankful, but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened: professing themselves to be wise they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and to four-footed beasts, and creeping things. Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts, to dishonor their own bodies between themselves: who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed forever. Amen." (Rom. 2: 18-25.) We quote the entire passage because the bearing of particular clauses upon the point in hand depends upon their connection with the whole. The Apostle is evidently speaking not of the Jews, but of the Gentiles—of the pagan world. The heathen hold the *truth*, he says, but in unrighteousness. This truth is that which may be known of God, and is manifest in them. It is manifest in the heathen because *God hath showed* it unto them. He showed them invisible things, even his eternal power and Godhead, which are clearly seen from the creation of the world. Nor was His presence and teaching in vain. For they knew God; but they did not glorify Him as God. Through the perverting power of sin they became unthankful for His goodness and mercy. Turning away from Him in the vanity of their imaginations they changed the glory of God into an image of a man and beast. Wherefore God gave them up to uncleanness; He had not thus given them up before; but as a consequence of their folly and wickedness He permitted them to change the truth of God, which they still possessed, into a lie, and then worship the creature more than the Creator. As God had shown the truth

unto the heathen; they knew God, the Creator; and because they knew the Creator they worshipped Him. But when their foolish heart was darkened they substituted the creature for the Creator.

If we correctly interpret the account which the Apostle gives of the spiritual condition of the heathen, we must believe that God by no means left them to themselves, but just as before the flood His Spirit strove with an apostate race, so after the flood did the same Spirit manifest God in them and to them; and, through the law written on their hearts, won them to the acknowledgment of the truth, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another. (Rom. 2 : 15.) Hence, as a result of divine action upon the mind of the pagan world, do their systems of religion comprehend the great truths which we call self-evident or intuitive, the truths which the Revelation of Christ presupposes and assumes at every step of its progress, and thus acknowledges to be divine. Nor was such manifestation of God in the heathen without purpose, nor in vain. On the one hand, it served to keep alive in them the deep sense of the need of a Deliverer, and on the other to perpetuate and unfold in them the religious capacity for that very different and higher work of the Spirit by which Christ should be formed in them the hope of glory when the fulness of the times had come.

There is no contradiction to this view of their religious history, in the idolatries, the inveterate corruptions, and abominable immoralities prevailing among the heathen. Just because they are wicked and vile by nature has it been the good pleasure of God to exercise the forbearance, mercy and condescension which the Apostle Paul teaches. And if even in the Church of Christ, which he purchased with His own blood, of which He is the living Head, and which is the "ground of the truth," the tares sown by the Enemy spring up with the wheat and are permitted to grow together until the time of harvest, how much more so in the pagan world upon which the glorious Sun of

Righteousness has not risen with the life-giving power of divine healing in his wings.

It follows that the presence and influences of the Spirit are not distinctive of Christianity; and if not distinctive, if the Spirit may in a certain sense be predicated of all the religions of the world, it does not touch the real point of difference between the two systems to say that the one is the religion of the Spirit, whilst the other is the religion of the flesh. There is indeed a creative work of the Holy Spirit, generically different from all His other known operations, which is the peculiar glory of Christianity, but this peculiar work is not inconsistent with the reality of that operation of the Spirit which obtains expression in non-Christian systems. There are diversities of operations; but it is the same God which worketh all in all. (1 Cor. 12: 6.) The flesh has not only exerted a corrupting influence in the religions of the world, but has also contributed towards bringing about the actual condition of Christianity and of the Church among men in every period of her history. The Spirit and the flesh are mutually exclusive; they are contrary the one to the other. On this point there is no difference of opinion. Still it is true that the influence of both is seen in the opposite systems, the influence of the Spirit in the development of religion, and the influence of the flesh, or of corrupt human nature, in the subjective development of Christianity.

All the distinctions between Religion and Christianity which we have now reviewed, fall short, as we think, of the true principle of difference. They all assume a point of observation which ignores the essential nature of Christianity; hence each one affirms something of Christianity, which, with certain restrictions, must be affirmed of religion also. To understand the real difference we need a principle which will enable us to affirm of Christianity what can be affirmed of it only, and to affirm of religion what can be affirmed of religion only. If Christianity be a new creation in Jesus Christ, its nature must differ in kind from the nature of the old or first creation; and it can possessa

no essential attributes in common with religion, or with any pagan system. Yet the two can not be sundered dualistically. There must be an intimate connection between religion and Christianity—much more intimate indeed than the distinctions we have considered admit—; for the whole process of Christian revelation goes forward on the assumption of a basis and demand for it already existing in the religious nature of the human race.

The discussion of the positive side of the general subject, however, we reserve for a second article, which, if God permit, shall appear in the next number of this *Review*.

E. V. G.

ART II.—CHRISTIAN UNION, AND THE LITURGICAL TENDENCIES
OF THE TIMES.*

ST. PAUL, in his exhortation to unity, says, "there is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." How at variance with this idea, does the visible Christian Church appear when submitted to the most superficial examination! The unity of the Spirit is *not* preserved in the bond of peace, but a number of sects or divisions, all grounding their hopes on the same truths, are battling, with the furious rage of Belial's troops, against

* Anniversary Address on Ministerial Union by T. H. Stockton, Pastor of the Church of the New Testament, &c. Phila. 1859. 36 pp.

Christian Union, and the Protestant Episcopal Church in its relations to Church Unity. By William H. Lewis, D. D., Rector of the Church of the Holy Trinity, Brooklyn, L. I. New York. 1859. pp. 116.

Mixed Societies, in Principle and in Practice. By the author of "An apology for the common English Bible," (Rev. A. C. Coxe, D. D.). Balt. 1858. pp. 84.

Review of "Mixed Societies." (Anonymous.) Balt. 1859. pp. 45.

each other for things that their honesty forbids them to look upon as essentials. The one body, the head of which is Christ, no longer shows itself as an organic unit, and the one Spirit seems to have assumed a great variety of forms, so that the enquirer for truth is bewildered in his search. Is the ideal unity, spoken of by Paul, not possible on earth, and are we doomed to grieve all our days that the strifes, dissensions and divisions of Christians are more difficult to quiet and to suppress, than those of politicians and mere men of the world? Political parties may be divided by sections and caucuses, but these are readily broken up when a decided and firm stand is required in an attack upon their opponents;—enemies become reconciled, hard words are thrown aside, and a common sentiment of love for, and pride in, their party animates all, so that the contest is active and vigorous. But how often are the good effects of Christian labors made null and void, by the spirit of sectarianism creeping in the council-chambers of the saints, and there contending for its own success rather than for that of the Church Catholic! As much joy (and even more in some instances) is felt in the transfer of a Christian from one denomination to another, from the superintendence of one shepherd to another, as is experienced when a sinner is brought from the paths of worldliness and sin into the walls of the Church. It is said that the different denominations constitute different regiments, all fighting in the great army of the Captain of our salvation, but who ever heard, in a well-regulated army, of desertions from one regiment to another,—of jubilant shoutings and extravagant demonstrations of joy at the increase of one portion at the expense of another? No! regiments, while possessed of a pride which makes them all the more active in time of service, would disdain increase of numbers obtained in this way. They are all contending for one common object, and under one great Commander,—but contentions among themselves, would destroy discipline and subvert all the plans of their leaders.

But Christ, in His ever-memorable prayer for His

Church, prays "that they all may be one; as Thou, Father, art in me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us, that the world may believe Thou hast sent me." Here is clearly embodied the typical condition of the Church, one in itself, one with Christ, so that even the world seeing this unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, might believe that He was sent by the Father. Now the present condition of the Church militant, not only militant against the world, the flesh and the devil, but against itself, is far from exhibiting this unity, and one interesting fact is presented to us in the recognition of this abnormal state of affairs by Christians generally. It is the first essential in the right direction, that we should clearly recognize our errors, see how they differ from that pristine condition when the Church, by its united and firm stand against the powers of the world, battled for the truth, in despite of death, life, principalities, powers, things present and things to come, none of which were able to separate it from the love of God as it is in Christ Jesus. Such a recognition of error prepares us for the close consideration of the manner in which we can retrace our steps, and strive after that spirit which, while it will allow *in dubiis libertas*, will require *in necessariis unitas*, and above all *in omnibus caritas*.

Most devout persons are anxious on the subject of Christian union, although we have heard a labored argument, from a Professor in a Theological Seminary, in support of the present condition of the Church, as being *best* adapted for its preservation in purity from the errors that heresy *might* introduce. Such special pleading, in support of *existing* error as a safe-guard against *presumptive* error, is too shallow to require refutation, and few can be found who will cling to it as any defence of division. But although the majority acknowledges the abnormal condition of the Church, and agree with commendable harmony in praying "that all who profess and call themselves Christians may be led into the way of truth, and hold the faith in *unity of Spirit*, in the bond of peace, and in righteousness of life," and that God would make the Church "strong and mighty

against all heresy and schism, against all error and corruption,"—still the nature of that common platform on which all can meet, is by no means agreed upon with unanimity. Each has his own plan to offer,—each some private conception of the way this great end is to be effected, which he considers as failing to be operative, *only* from the fact that the world is so full of bigotry, so opinionated that it will not yield to the suggestions which his mature reflection have produced.

There are, however, several plans of union that have been proposed and have collected around them warm and enthusiastic supporters. A glance at these, and a kind consideration of their defects, and hence, their probable ultimate failure, will not be out of place here.

I. Although Christians are attached to their own denominations, and should labor for the success of these, still they *may* meet on the common ground of the great *Benevolent Societies* of the day. The Bible Society is intended for the distribution of the Holy Scriptures without note or comment; the Tract Society for the publication and dissemination of stirring appeals to the impenitent and lukewarm, and the Sunday School Union for the preparation of proper apparatus to be used in the training up of children to the stature of Christian manhood. Are these great organizations not proper spheres for Christians to labor in, and will not such labor conduce to the tightening of the cords of Christian union? View the religious history of our country for the last forty years, and see whether such has been the effect. Has the number of denominations diminished under the action of these Societies,—have the congregations, whose ministers have been most active in their management, coalesced or united in brotherly love, outside of the anniversary meetings? Such questions are significant and pregnant with importance in the determination of the subject we are now examining. They are propounded without any idea of denouncing these great agencies, but with the view of showing how inadequate these are for the solution of the mighty problem,—

how there shall be a union of that body, which is now so rent and divided. We need organizations for the preparation and distribution of the Sacred Scriptures, for the dissemination of such material as will explain its meaning and publish the loving tidings of the Gospel, to superintend the education of the little ones of this world. They are needed, because the Church, in any one of its present phases, seems to have neglected these duties, and to have indolently folded its hands and waited for some action outside of itself. They can be made better adapted for the purposes, set forth in their constitutions, if the Church will superintend them, will control them, will use them as agencies *through* which she can operate. If she suffer herself to be controlled *by* them, then is harm done, if in no other way, by her loss of power in the carrying out of her peculiar office, as is always the case when control is consigned to other hands than those to which it properly belongs. If the Church was established, on the day of Pentecost, "as the home of Christ's continual presence and power among men," then must she be the prime mover in all operations which relate to the distribution of the Scriptures, to instruction in the way of life, and to the feeding of those lambs, as Christ commanded Peter when he professed his love for the Master. If there be a ministry, whose members are "the representatives of Christ's authority and the ambassadors of His grace," then surely these agencies should be committed to their care, and to their superintendence should the active operations of such Societies be assigned. But here we find the sect-difficulty coming up again, and, in the midst of the hoped for union, there is division; some will not unite in the work,—others require so much to be removed from the pages of Tracts and Sunday-school books that they lose their positive character and become too often of a vague and general nature. The evils are, however, *not* of such a character as to call for the extinction of these Societies, but for their use under the superintendence, control and direction of the Christian Churches, none giving up what it considers vital, but en-

deavoring to supply the deficiencies by the aid of its own ministry, and instead of becoming indolent in the work assigned it, knowing no rest night or day, but laboring to perform its duties in the great vineyard of the Lord. These Societies have not promoted, and are not likely to promote, Christian union,—but have been made useful, and can be made still more so, if the Church will labor to prevent the ignoring of fundamental truth in the effort to be generally acceptable to all parties. They would have no existence in a true, normal state of the Church, nor would Benevolent Societies, Insurance Companies, Alms-houses, City Hospitals and a thousand other charitable plans of the present be necessary, were the Church as it was on the day of Pentecost. They have all sprung up as lamentable proofs of her short-comings, and must stand until the happy day when she is regenerated and disenthralled from the corruptions of ages. If there be evils in these benevolent agencies, let them be removed, and let them be made as useful adjuvants as possible to the Church, but do not let them usurp her place and duties.

II. Christian union can be reached by associations which will have no creed but the Bible, and such bodies can rightly take charge of all benevolent operations; nay more, can perform all the duties of the Christian ministry, save alone the administration of the two sacraments, Holy Baptism and the Lord's Supper. This is the second plan of Christian union, which, in a peculiar way, seems to have been developed from the first noticed. It boasts the uselessness of Creeds,—their *injury* to the cause of Christ, inasmuch as they constitute points around which crystallize, according to definite laws, their adherents, presenting angles and edges sharply set against anything like union. The Reformation in Germany and England is considered as defective in the fact, that it did not throw off the effete creeds of the Romish Church, and proclaim full liberty of interpretation of the Scriptures, according to each man's private judgment. Had this been done, then we should have a *harmonious* (*lucus a non lucendo*, we suppose) Church,

no sects, no divisions, but all agreeing—in what, we are not able to say, except in the right of each man to disagree with his neighbor. The fallacy of such a position is apparent, for even granting that each Christian could thus attain the full stature of godliness, the whole body of Christians would be, when compared with the condition of a Church faithful to a symbol embodying its views of scriptural doctrine, like a vast collection of little shrubs as compared with the sturdy tree whose roots are fastly attached, deep under the solid earth, and whose branches, luxuriating in an abundant flow of healthy sap, afford shade and protection to the weary and oppressed of every clime. Instead of a living organism, the Church would be an aggregation of foreign particles, adhering together with no great force or vital connection.

But throwing aside all considerations arising from a proper estimate of the true idea of the Church, what are the effects of this proposed plan of Christian union? Does the Baptist, who meets his Presbyterian brother on this common ground, waive his exclusiveness and invite him to meet him at the Lord's table,—will he admit him to the privileges which should be the common property of those who acknowledge one Lord and one faith? Here is the test of sincerity—or rather, here is the test of the strength and truth of the so-called Christian union. Will it be said that this is a subject about which all are allowed honestly to differ,—about which peculiar and exclusive views may be held? If so, then is the union, in our opinion, one of form and not of fact.

Again, the Christian ministry is overlooked to a great extent by this movement. The laity are placed in the position of those who have been solemnly set apart from the worldly pursuits of business “to wait upon and serve the Church,—to offer before Christ the prayers and supplications of His people; to feed, to instruct, to watch over and guide the sheep and lambs of His flock, whom He hath purchased with His own blood.” Circumstances may arise when a godly layman should take charge of religious meet-

ings, in case of the absence of a minister, although it is even then better that he should be an officer set apart, as the elders and deacons, in many of our churches are, by the public laying on of hands for Church work. But where an effort is specially made to put forward the layman at the expense of the minister, is it not an evil committed against the calling of the latter, against the office which Christ Himself solemnly instituted for the use of His Church? The defence is often made for this course of procedure,—that more good can be done by the layman, and that he is not suspected of interested motives in his efforts to win souls,—more confidence is reposed in him. If this be so, then it is high time for the ministry to be purged, and for those who are so peculiarly fitted for its duties to be fairly and in due form invested with them. Is not the possession of such peculiar qualifications for doing good a strong indication of a call to assume the position of a regular leader in the Christian army?

Another objection to this movement towards union, is, that its members becoming restive under authority, are intolerant towards those who are not operating with them in their Associations. While they virtually deny the possession of the disciplinary power to the ministry and church council, as given in those mysterious words of Christ—"Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven"—they act with apparent authority in condemning those who do not use the Shibboleth of their faith as the countersign. Thus prayer was offered for the conversion of the author of *Mixed Societies*—a pamphlet taking ground against these Societies—shortly after its publication, at one of the meetings of such an Association. It is not an uncommon thing for the zealous, wherever found, unless held in by wholesome restraints, to forget that charity, which grants to a brother the use of his own religious views, and to pour on his head the condemnation of an enthusiasm that is approximating to bigotry. In the glow of feeling that arises from trust in God, how often are all

intolerant to those, whose stand-point gives them another view of the great truths of religion and their relations to men.

But over and above these objections, is the idea of the ultimate destiny of this movement. Will it swallow up Christian denominations, cause the disappearance of even one of them? We fear not,—one of its principal oracles speaks thus* of “the new converts at Quakertown,—“already forming a true spiritual Church in Christ Jesus, and desiring to know what is now their duty in regard to outward church organization. Over their simple pulpit, it seems, was suspended the ministerial motto: ‘For I determined not to know anything among you save Jesus Christ, and him crucified.’ Under this banner, it was stated, they were brought to Christ; and they are ignorant of any other. * * Who shall counsel them to become Old School Presbyterians? or Baptists? or Methodists? or Episcopalians? * * As in the days of the Apostles, the Lord himself is adding unto the Church such as are saved. He makes them Christians, whole Christians, and nothing but Christians. * * They cannot bear the thought of being divided into different Denominations with opposite principles and jarring interests.” He further adds, in a note, these significant sentences, which show what his views are with reference to “the case at Quakertown.” “Surely the whole subject of Christian union contains no simpler question than this:—*How shall New Converts escape Denominational divisions, and remain united as Christians?* Thank the Lord, that this question begins to be pressed upon us!” Here we have the ultimate destiny of this movement, according to the notions of one of its friends,—the establishment of a Church which shall not be denominational but still remain Christian;—Separate from all the present Christian Churches and form another which shall not be fettered with denominational peculiarities. When the good brother succeeds in his Herculean task, he will have

* Ministerial Union, pp. 34 35.

accomplished the greatest paradox of the age, as he will show how addition can be made to the number of sects, without investing the additional one with sectarian character.

III. But a third plan of Christian Union is proposed, which looks more plausible than the two we have just noticed. Let each denomination appoint its best men to meet in solemn, prayerful conference, ready and willing to yield up all non-essentials, and to form a platform, wide and broad enough, to bear all who can be comprehended within the limits of Evangelical Christianity. Let the motto, of such a grand synodical meeting, be "*Charity*," and, under its blessed influences, something may be done towards exterminating the hydra-headed monster—sectarianism. There is that about this plan which recommends it to the kindly consideration of every Christian man. Judging by the results of Conventions, held to settle difficulties between men, companies and even governments, we might suppose that this plan would meet every hope as regards Christian Union. There is a fairness about it,—a freedom from bigotry which is really captivating to the mind wearied with the continuous warfare that brothers carry on against each other. If Christians are in earnest when they express their regret at the distracted condition of the Church, surely they will not object to a series of compromises, which will lead to a harmonious commingling of all sects. But alas! we have learned from experience that, although fair, beautiful and attractive, this plan has never produced any results at all conducing to the end after which all Christendom is longing. No mere system of compromises accompanied by alterations or intertwinings or dovetailings of creeds and symbols,—no merely mechanical plan has ever yet succeeded in bringing together the different fragments of Christianity. Nor is it possible that union, thus produced, can be permanent. There must be a living connection between a Church and its symbol, and no amount of diplomacy,—no amount of legislative tact can destroy such connection with the hope of substituting another.

The attempt in Prussia to consolidate the two great non-Romanist denominations is now beginning to show itself as a failure. Instead of extinguishing the Lutheran and Reformed Churches by the establishment of the Evangelical Church, the result is the establishment of three. Those, whose life-connection was most intimate with their Church symbols, found that this was not transferable. They could no more transfer themselves from it to another than a fish could transfer its sphere of action from water to land. Their whole spiritual being had been adapted to one element, and could not be harmoniously developed,—could not exist at all in any other. It may be said here, but the united Church of Prussia is much greater in numbers than those which thus cling with the warmth of first love to their peculiar symbols,—that these are but fragmentary portions of the great body of Protestants in Prussia, and hence this well-meant effort of the government of Prussia is in fact a success. Still such an answer cannot destroy the fact that the denominational distinctions have not been swallowed up in this effort towards union.

The defunct Triennial Convention of the Dutch Reformed and German Reformed Churches, which promised so much good, is another instance of failure at Church union. The religious bodies, here acting in good faith, recognized the same symbolical book, had many interests in common, were sister churches, reared up under the same teachings, and yet, from the very first, it was evident to the reflecting mind that the Convention-arrangement was something peculiarly mechanical,—it did not involve a life which could manifest itself in the two Churches, as though they were but different branches of one common stalk. After a short existence, this arrangement was severed to the great satisfaction of both parties, who found that no good resulted from it, while it was prolific in the engendering of strife and contention.

For a like reason, the arrangement, by which a quasi-correspondence is kept up between various religious bodies, has been productive of nothing but empty complimentary

speeches and vapid expressions of general interest in each other's progress and history. The delegate makes his appearance and is admitted to a seat on the floor of the Presbytery or Synod, acts as a quiet observer for a few days and then, in a parting speech, presents the good wishes of his denomination and expresses the great pleasure the visit has given him; while the presiding officer, not to be outdone in fraternal courtesy, fully reciprocates every kind thing that has been said and officially begs that the warmest expression of interest, in the welfare of the sister Church, may be communicated by its representative. The meaningless character of this correspondence is beginning now to be understood and appreciated by those who have heretofore been most enthusiastic for it, and it is difficult to find representatives who take sufficient interest to perform the duties connected with their appointment, or even to attend the meetings of the ecclesiastical bodies. This is painful to contemplate, but surely it is better that we should abolish a relation of this kind, if its only fruit is the expression of a string of empty compliments. Let us have active, heartfelt participation, or let there be none at all. Mere compliments are nothing more than mere lies.

IV. The only ground on which Christians can meet is that of an Episcopally ordained ministry. This is urged now with great force by a large portion of the Protestant Episcopal Church of this country, and some are disposed to allow considerable latitude on matters of a rubrical nature, should the ministers of other Churches submit themselves to their ordination. "The Memorial," which was presented to the House of Bishops some years since, gave assurance that the authors were honest and sincere in their expressions of anxiety for Christian union. The House of Bishops adopted the following resolution: "*Resolved, As the opinion of the House of Bishops, That in view of the desirableness of union among Christians, and as a pledge of willingness to communicate or receive information tending to that end; and, in order to conference, if occasion or opportunity should occur, this House will appoint, by bal-*

lot, a committee of five Bishops, as an organ of communication or conference with such Christian bodies, or individuals, as may desire it; to be entitled "The Commission on Church Unity." That, in making the above appointment, it is distinctly understood that the Commission is clothed with no authority to mature plans of unity with other Christian bodies, or to propound expositions of doctrine or discipline." Such a resolution shows that a warm feeling exists in this body, as in all others, with reference to this important subject, although, to use the words of Dr. Lewis, "*Episcopal* ordination is now, and probably ever will be, a *sine qua non* of union with our Protestant brethren."

Dr. Lewis, in his pamphlet on Christian Union, has set forth at full length, and with a respectful consideration for other Christian bodies, the relations of the Protestant Episcopal Church. A brief examination of the difficulties connected with this plan will show how, in the present stage of the development of the Church, it is not likely to be more successful than the other plans already discussed in this article.

First, let us see the arguments brought forward by its advocates. A few extracts from the pamphlet of Dr. Lewis will furnish these. "It is hopeless to think of a restoration of unity to the rent Church of Christ, until we can be one in regard to the ministry. It is vain to think of the world's conversion till we all become one in Christ. If we could settle upon a ministry which would satisfy all evangelical Protestants, it would leave little else in the way of unity among Protestants and put us in a position most hopeful towards Churches not Reformed." (Page 80.) "The claims of the Protestant Church in respect to the ministry are those which, in the eyes of our brethren, present the greatest obstacle to union with us; nay, they charge us with perpetuating schisms by our exclusiveness on that point. If we are conscientiously satisfied that our claims are of divine right and authority, they themselves must allow that we cannot do otherwise than maintain them. And

further, if by any means they could be satisfied to receive our orders, and the unity of the Church might be restored thereby, then it is their duty to yield to us on this point, even though contented with their own ministry, and the guilt of perpetrating schisms rests on them,—not on us. If we are in conscience bound to our ordination, and they will not undertake to say that it is invalid, it belongs to them to remove the bar to union, by conceding to us a ministry which they with good conscience can receive, and we with good conscience cannot renounce." (Page 64.) "If any denomination were desirous to have a bishop or bishops consecrated from among themselves in our line of succession, to confer orders—if, for instance, the opportunity were now afforded, as when Calvin approved a moderate Episcopacy, and the leaders of Methodism desired it, we trust we could say to our brethren, 'We regard our Episcopate as a gift from Christ to the world; take it from us, and use it with no limitation from us, save that such safeguards be adopted that it be not abused to further heresy.'" (Page 76.)

Now, through all these quotations there runs an assumption that we think can hardly be accepted as susceptible of demonstration, viz: that similarity of ordination is all that is necessary to collect the scattered remnants of the Christian Church. In fact does not experience show, that this is *not* conducive in any marked way to unity. Is not the validity of ordination by presbyters admitted by nearly all non-episcopal bodies, and do not nearly all require that this should be performed with the "laying on of the hands of the presbytery?" With a ministry thus set apart for sacred purposes, so recognized that its members frequently exchange pulpits to the complete satisfaction of their congregations, do the non-episcopal bodies show any remarkable tendency to Church unity? And, on the other hand, are the bodies, who have adhered with zealous tenacity to exclusive episcopal ordination, at all distinguished for affinities drawing them closely together? We trow not. Does the Roman Catholic priest exchange duties and priestly services with

the priest of the Greek Church,—or do the Episcopally ordained ministers of the Swedish Lutheran, the Moravian, and the Anglican Churches, exhibit any tendencies towards that Christian fraternization which would lead us to hope for their union? A negative answer must be given also to this question. If such be the facts in the present condition of those Churches, whose ordination is alike, how can we admit the assumption of Dr. Lewis as at all *axiomatic* in our philosophizing on this subject? Alas! even this slight hope of union is removed from us.

But, assuming that similarity of ordination *would* be promotive of Christian Union, let us now see whether his idea concerning the adoption of Episcopal ordination involves no sacrifice of principle on the part of non-Episcopal ministers, and whether “with *good conscience* they could receive” such ordination. What is involved in an admission of the *necessity* of Episcopal ordination? Nothing more and nothing less than the admission that all ministerial acts, performed by others, are null and void. Admitting the universal priesthood of believers, only the baptismal services of such ministers, as are non-Episcopally ordained, could be recognized as valid. Hence, he, who applies for Episcopal ordination, thereby publicly denies the validity of all the other ministerial services he has ever performed, including of course, as most peculiarly unjustifiable, his administration of the sacred elements at the holy communion. His special priestly functions have been so many evidences of usurpation, which he publicly avows to have been wrong, to say the least, and most probably evidences of sacrilegious desecration. Now it is perfectly clear, that there are few, if any, ministers of non-Episcopal bodies, who would be *conscientiously* prepared to make these admissions,—to avow that they had been grossly in error, even with the hope of thereby promoting, what it is not at all certain could be thus promoted, Christian Union. Such are the insuperable difficulties in the way of the adoption of the fourth plan, which prevent all hope of its ever being considered feasible. Such re-ordination would imply the

necessity of a re-confirmation of all their Church-members, and, with those whose views are not sufficiently Churchly to recognize the validity of *lay*-baptism, of re-baptism, or, at least, of hypothetical baptism of all comprised within their congregations. We submit these difficulties to the consideration of our author, and ask whether we go too far in pronouncing them, *at present*, as insuperable.

It is true that as regards those about entering on the ministry, these objections do not hold with so much force, although even then they would be obliged to submit to re-confirmation, which would also imply a desertion of those principles they had hitherto held as precious and true. And young men, who would thus submit to Episcopal confirmation and ordination, would most likely elect the Episcopal Church proper as the sphere of their labors and duties, thus preventing their act having any effect at all upon the very religious bodies intended to be brought into one fold.

But, admitting the necessity of such ordination as directly promotive of Church Unity, and waiving the difficulties mentioned in the last two paragraphs, another question comes up for consideration, Why should orders be obtained from the Protestant Episcopal Church in particular? Might not the ministers of the German Churches, and more particularly those of the Lutheran Churches, say we prefer to have our ordination from that Church which approaches most nearly our own as regards the period of its secession from Rome,—we will go to Sweden, where an undoubted Episcopal succession has been preserved, and, from its bishops, we will ask this privilege, which it is alleged will cause the disappearance of divisions. Or, others of another shade of religious feeling might elect ordination at the hands of Moravian bishops, who claim continuity of succession. Or, others, again, might say, we are worn down by the trials of our position, why not go to the Romish Church, and from its authorities receive that power, which presbyterial laying on of hands will not confer. Is it not very evident that as great contrariety of action,

as this, would be inevitable, even were we to admit the correctness of the author's position.

We are not blind to the great benefits which flow from Episcopal government,—how the office of bishop, in its peculiar sense as confined to one man invested with special powers and privileges over and above his fellow-ministers, may be made conducive to the support of order and discipline, the preservation of sound doctrine and the concentration of the efforts of the Church. We are not satisfied but that much of the trouble, arising from the want of such an office, in the way of the division of the Church into numerous sects, might not have measurably been avoided had its government been more generally Episcopal. We recognize, with hearty good will and thankfulness to God, the wonderful success of the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country, and would bid it God-speed in its laudable undertakings, its missionary and benevolent operations. Its past history is rich with the lives of sainted men, whose writings and deeds are the property of the Church Catholic, and its future bids us hope a continuation of its activity and energy. But we can not see how Church Unity is to be effected *now*, through an acceptance of Episcopal ordination, by those who recognize presbyterial ordination as of *equal* validity. The customs and traditions of three centuries, together with the blessings which have resulted from the ministrations of men ordained by Presbyteries,—these prevent this plan from receiving full sanction from non-Episcopalians, and show that it is likely to be of as little avail towards the desired Christian Union as the other three mentioned.

What then! are we to believe, if we admit these plans as not likely to produce Church Union, that there *must* be divisions and sections in the Church? Is there *no* hope of quieting the sect-spirit? Is there *no* hope that the time may come, when, in name and feelings, in word and in deed, we may practically understand and act in accordance with Paul's words: "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female:

for ye are all *ONE* in Christ Jesus?" Yes! there is hope, simply because we are assured it will be so, although there may be much tribulation before such an end is attained. "The actual Church is still very far from being a perfect Church. * * As it now stands especially, the Church, with its divine life-powers, is not confined to any one organization exclusively, * * but extends its presence, with different measures of power, over different and divided communions. It has no sympathy indeed with the spirit of division and sect; but still it allows the evil to be comprehended for a time in the evolution of its life, (just as the abuses of the papacy were comprehended in it before the Reformation,) in order that all may be the more gloriously surmounted in the end."* Such words are cheering to the desponding spirit. They bid us have faith in the Providence of God as His plans are unfolded in the world, faith in History (which is nothing but the revelation of the Divine plans). There can be no forcing History to a rapid exhibition of results,—it is a process, which advances on towards its final completion, under the agency of laws above the comprehension of finite minds. No quickening means, devised by the intellect of man, can hasten this process, which proceeds slowly and measuredly with the dignity and grandeur that specially marks all the works of the Supreme Being. Let us not be disheartened and sickened at the discords of the present; they may all be necessary, as preliminaries to those grand harmonies which shall accord with the hymn that the angels sang, when the announcement of a Saviour was made to the shepherds,—they may all be employed by the Lord to redound, not only to His glory, but to the establishment of "peace on earth, good will to men." We can hope for very little from societies, associations, ecclesiastical conventions, or from the adoption of particular Church doctrines, towards Church-union. These are, after all, minor points. They do not reach the heart of the subject. They are all me-

* The Church, by Rev. J. W. Nevin, D. D. 14.

chanical appliances, proposed as substitutes for that which is organic and living. We must strive to get the Church-life, the Christian faith, that which is embodied in the Creed, and then we shall find differences removed, not by conventional arrangement, but thrown off by the life-vigor that will permeate our organizations. Sects, in proportion as they learn to live and move in the Creed, will gradually approach each other in faith and practice, until at last the division walls will have so thinned away that, with the glad shouts of rejoicing believers, they shall fall, even as the walls of Jericho fell on the seventh day, after having been compassed at first in silence by the people.

In the first volume of this Review it was shown that,* "For the settlement of our existing theological and ecclesiastical difficulties, the first and most indispensable necessity is a true and hearty inward submission to the authority of the Creed, according to its original intention and design. * * The first condition of all sound theology is, active sympathy with historical Christianity, with the idea of the Church, with the Catholic mystery of the Creed. *

* We must be in the Creed, and so have faith in the Church, in order to determine it, or to settle its exact form and limits." Here, then, we have an indispensable prerequisite, which, being adopted, removes grounds of dissension as to the *form* of the Church. If the faith be right, there can be no cause for discussion.

It is worse than idle to permit discussion as to the proper form for the actual Church. We are not possessed now with the material for such discussion, and we can only assure ourselves that the form will be such as its nature and uses will require. Dr. Lewis himself honestly admits,† "None of us have a perfect system, whatever its excellencies, and when God shall build up again His one true Catholic Church it will probably be with materials gathered from all existing Churches."

But do the signs of the times indicate anything like an approximation towards union? We think so, and pro-

* I. 344, 345 and 346.

† Christian Union. 27.

pose now to direct the attention of our readers to a feature in the present condition of Christianity which is a hopeful indication that the dawn of better things is approaching. And this feature is the wakening up of Christians to a true idea of worship, proceeding mostly from a closer study and appreciation of the Apostles' Creed.

THE LITURGICAL TENDENCIES OF THE TIMES are remarkable, in the fact that they do not rise from any particular local point and then extend by ever-enlarging circles. There is no one *focus* from whence they proceed, but numerous foci—appearing here and there in every denomination in our land. They cannot be attributed to the influence of any one school of theology, but have grown up from the necessities of the case, and have acted upon individuals, whether willing or unwilling, with such power as to cause these to demand liturgical services in some form or other. Those denominations, which sprang into existence under liturgical forms, adopting the old ones, with slight modifications, as their own peculiar birth-right, have returned to their first love, joyously fleeing from the so-called *free* worship of Puritanism to that which is less slavish because the offering of the spirit of every worshipper; and those that have been ushered into existence without such blessed privileges, begin to yearn with irrepressible desire after some liturgical character for their worship, which will enable it to be freed from the danger of taking its character from the physical condition of the minister.

The liturgical tendencies of the Present have been partly occasioned, as a species of reaction from the loose and rhetorical character which public prayers have been made to assume. The idea of prayer seems to have entirely escaped the minds of some ministers, and it is made the means of communicating truths to the congregation, of narrating events and incidents, or exhibiting rhetorical skill and *belles-letttristic* ability. Hence we have the terms familiarly employed on all sides, "*eloquent prayer*," "*impressive prayer*," &c., which are specially significant, since they show that prayer is valued by its hearers on account

of the rhetorical dress with which it is clad, and not because it embodies their own sense of sin, deep contrition, humble petition for forgiveness, and thanksgiving for past and present mercies. The heartfelt petition of the publican would be considered, by no means, an *eloquent* prayer at the present day, although our Lord tells us that he went down to his house *justified*.

The distinction between a prayer to the Almighty, and a sermon for the instruction of the congregation, has long since been lost with some, and both assume the character of the sermon. Mr. Spurgeon offers up,* in a prayer, "a petition for Reform, and that Parliament might be enabled not to talk but to do something." But as an illustration of the worst conception of prayer probably on record, we transcribe some extracts from one offered† "on the occasion of the funeral solemnities while the remains of Dr. Kane lay in state in the State Chamber, Columbus, O.," by a minister of the Congregational Church. We feel that we should apologize to the readers of the Review for the insertion of such material, but we wish to give a specimen of the kind of prayer which is esteemed as both eloquent and impressive. * * "We have come hither to pay our last respects to the earthly remains of one of whom when living we all had heard, and whom we had learned to love and revere. Thy thoughts are not our thoughts, nor are thy ways our ways, Lord God Almighty; thou didst hold him in thy hand when wind and waters and all nature were against him. Thou didst bear him through storm, and cold, and darkness, and famine, and fear, and didst set him down safely on the deck of the *Release*. And when the cheers of his countrymen welcomed him back to the social world of love which they represented, hope elevated and joy brightened his crest. Long had he trod the ice-foot in safety. Through two Arctic winters God had kept him. And in the third under the mild light of a genial climate, before the returning sun had gilded the topmast of the *Advance* in her ice-bound home, the floes yielded beneath

* Athenaeum. Dec. 26, 1857.

† Elder's Life of Kane. 327.

his feet and he passed into the eternal sea. * * * Bear with us, O Lord, if in our addresses to thee we make mention of the virtues of him whose loss we deplore. For he acknowledged God as the author of his powers, and it was a part of his wisdom to know whose gift he was. Much had he seen, and known, and done. His feet had touched the soil of every continent on the globe, and his temples had been laved in the waters of every sea. His life was a voyage of discovery. Already the benefits of his labors are felt, more or less, in every country. His plans were original, and as full of humanity as they were of genius. He had been endowed with superior powers both of mind and body, and where others perished he survived. But the silver cord is loosed at last, the golden bowl is broken, the pitcher is broken at the fountain, and the wheel is broken at the cistern. The dust will return to the earth as it was; but the spirit has returned unto God who gave it. The shades of a more-than-Arctic night have settled on his dust,—a night that knows no day; but the spirit is bathing in the mellow light of day,—a day that knows no night. The Advance is in the ice, the Eric is in ashes, the Hope is on a far-distant shore, the Faith—the “precious relic”—is in possession of his country, and Kane is in heaven. He will need the craft no more, for now he walks with the Evangelists upon the crystal and stable sea.” This and more, which we forbear to quote; enough has been given *usque ad nauseam*; what follows borders slightly upon the profane. Who can read this epitome of a gallant man’s life and believe for one moment, unless he had been assured of the fact, that it formed part of a prayer addressed by a created being to an *Omniscient Creator*? When such material is offered from the pulpit, who dare wonder, that a people will turn, with anxious longing, to those sublime devotional forms which the early Church employed to address the throne of Mercy, and which, with slight modifications, constitute the Liturgies of the present day.

No one, who has ever studied the subject, will think for

a moment that one's devotion, whether private or public, is fettered by forms. We are raised, by an honest and faithful use of these, to a height of devotion seldom attained by the use of extempore or unstudied sentences. Of course, unless the heart is warmly engaged in prayer, it matters little what may be the words that proceed from the lips,—they are but sad mockery. We think, however, when the body is worn down with fatigue and the mind is affected by this so as to be inactive and sluggish, that forms then can be employed with great comfort. The very effort to appropriate them is comforting to the wearied soul. And in the solemn Litanies of the past how peculiarly appropriate does every sentence seem to be to the case of every one using them,—commencing with the cry for mercy to the Holy Trinity, then the petitions that God would spare us from the just punishment of our sins for the sake of His most precious blood that had been shed for us, that He would deliver us from all spiritual and earthly dangers, from ecclesiastical insubordination, that He would help us and all mankind in all dangers and enable us to triumph over Satan; that He would preserve those who are in especial peril and extend His mercy to the prisoners and captives; that He would defend and provide for those who are orphaned, desolate or oppressed;—what is not included in this grand old form of supplication, and what congregation has ever, with devotional feelings, employed it without being satisfied that no words of their own could so fully express their wants and needs?

Again, we are specially warned against the use of "vain repetitions," (which are indeed more or less common in all extempore prayers) such as the heathen use "for they think that they shall be heard from their much speaking," and told to pray "*after this manner*," and the *manner* is indicated in that grandest of all prayers—the Lord's prayer, short, concise, embracing the whole circle of human wants and epitomizing all that can possibly form the material of prayer,—one of the first things taught the infant at his mother's knee, his companion through life, dearer to him

with each repetition, more and more replete with meaning, comforting and solacing him in disease and distress, and making glad the hour of his departure. And why not? Are not the words those of His Saviour, who hath taught him to call the high and mighty Ruler of the universe—his Father, to whom is ascribed “the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever and ever, Amen.” No wonder we are told that “John Newton said, That if he could use the Lord’s Prayer, entering into the spirit of every word, he should consider it as the highest devotional attainment of his life.” Miss Yonge, in one of her late productions, (we can hardly call them works of fiction,—they are too true to life) sets forth the effects of the use of one petition in this prayer by the hero—a great, Christian soul—when he was suffering from the effects of malice: “as if there was power in the words alone, he forced his lips to repeat,—*Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us.* Coldly and hardly were they spoken at first: again he pronounced them, again, again,—each time the tone was softer, each time they came more from the heart. At last the remembrance of greater wrongs and worse revilings came upon him; his eyes filled with tears, the most subduing and healing of all thoughts—that of the great Example—became present to him; the foe was driven back.” Has not many a man just such a scene in his past history?

In the Liturgical services that have been published for the use of different denominations, what is peculiarly remarkable in them all is the tendency to return to the forms set forth in the early Liturgies. These, as is known, were made to rest upon the Holy Communion as the greatest of all forms of worship, and those are now found to make more account of its celebration than was done years since. Committees, appointed to prepare such formulæ for public worship, have willingly confessed their total unfitness for the construction of prayers and collects, which shall have the same fullness and devotional sense as those put forth by the early Church, and have felt it their great privilege

to reinstate these in the position they once occupied. Those are mistaken who suppose that *new* Liturgies are new compositions,—they are simply *adaptations* of old forms to the needs and wants of the present. Dr. Lewis has fallen into such a mistake when he speaks thus of the Provisional Liturgy of the German Reformed Church,—“How can those who have prepared it suppose that they, in their studies, can mould a service to be compared with one which has grown into perfectness by the contributions, the experience, the use, the wants, the piety of nearly two thousand years?” The most important portion of this book—the Communion Service—is based upon, not the subjective notions and ideas of the Committee but the ancient Liturgies, as the most superficial examination will satisfy the reader. Besides this, the early history of this Church, after its secession from Romish rule, is peculiarly rich in Liturgies; Leo Juda prepared one in 1523,—others were set forth in 1525 and 1535 at Zurich, and the Palatinate Liturgy dates from 1563. Members of this Church are said to have been active in assisting the Committee who prepared the Book of Common Prayer, as is intimated by Daniel, in these words—*Ut vulgo fertur his viris (i. e. the committee appointed by King Edward) non defuit theologorum Reformatorum Exterorum auctoritas atque consilium Petri Martyris, P. Fagii ac M. Bucer et Johannis a Lasco.** This is doubted by Weber, who asserts that Bucer and Martyr did not visit England until the book was completed. It is a matter of history, however, that Bucer was appointed Professor of Theology in Cambridge, 1549, and lived two years in the performance of the duties of the chair, and that his body, with that of Fagius (who had left Germany at the same time and for the same reasons”—on invitation from Cramner—) “were burned,” being chained upright to a stake in the reign of Mary.† Schmidt, in his life of P. Martyr, mentions that Bucer, in company with Martyr, prepared a critique on the English book, entitled *Censura super libro sacrorum*. This, along with others

* Daniel. Cod. Lit. 111. 297.

† New Amer. Cyclopaedia.

objections, had the effect to secure alterations through a Commission named by the King, and, to use Schmidt's words*—"Den 6 April 1552, wurde diese (the Book of Common Prayer) revidirte, dem einfachen reformirten Typus näher gebrachte Liturgie von dem Parlamente angenommen. Sie war ein bedeutender Fortschritt in dem Werke der englischen Reformation, und ein neuer Beweis von dem *Einflusse*, den *Martyr* und *Butzer* auf diese ausübten." Schmidt adds—"Die Arbeit Butzer's über die Liturgie war eines seiner letzten Werke." Thus, it will be seen that the Reformers of the Anglican and German Churches were operating, in the early history of these Churches, *harmoniously* in the preparation of liturgical services, and their descendants, employing the results of their labors, should thankfully receive the work of their hands as a most precious boon.

Modern Liturgies, we say, are not modern compositions, nor are they reprints of the Book of Common Prayer, but all base their value upon the early forms which were prepared in those times when the Church was fully infused with the spirit of its Master and His teachings.

Another point in these Liturgies is the fact that they are more or less expositions or unfoldings of the Apostles' Creed. In the German Reformed Liturgy, this venerable symbol is placed *first*, as embodying the sum of the Christian's faith, not as set over against the Holy Scriptures, but as epitomizing that which they contain as necessary for a Christian to believe in order that he may be saved. The Church Book prepared for the use of St. Peter's (Presbyterian) church, Rochester, N. Y., in the morning service, leaves it to the discretion of the minister "to invite the congregation to stand and say with him the Creed of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, being that commonly called the Apostles' Creed," and requires its use in the administration of the Lord's Supper. The Liturgy of the French Protestant church, Charleston, S. C., requires the use of the Creed in the morning and

* Schmidt's P. Martyr Vermigli, 125.

evening service. The Liturgy, published by the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States, leaves it discretionary with the minister "to pronounce the Creed" in the service for the Lord's day. All these Liturgies thus show more or less tendency, not only in their forms, but in the respect and great account thus made of the Creed, towards Christian Union.

A most interesting publication proceeding from the Unitarian Church, published in 1858, would seem to show that, even there, the members were longing for something more than the dry morality which has hitherto constituted its doctrine,—were desirous of retracing their steps to the cross and *there* acknowledging the man Christ Jesus as the Son of God. We refer to the Service Book published for use in the Chapel of Harvard University. This contains full services for all the festival days, (including saints' days) of the Church year,—the unaltered Apostles' Creed, and a Communion service from the Liturgy of St. James. The mere appearance of the Apostles' Creed in a Unitarian book, is a protest against the system, and is the admission of a glorious light which must increase in brilliancy until it shall bring this body back to the precious truths involved in a recognition of the Trinity. Its repetition, in public service, will surely bring the worshipper to a serious consideration of the difference between his faith and that of the apostles, martyrs, confessors, saints, holy men and women, who while in the Church militant lived and died in full assurance of the truth of the articles of this *Symbolum Magnum*, and who now in the Church triumphant are allowed the privilege of joining the "ten thousand times ten thousand and thousands of thousands" in saying "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing." If the Creed had been preserved in all the Churches, could Unitarianism indeed have attained the numbers it now claims? Would it be possible for a people to be led off from the doctrine of the Trinity by any minister, if the Creed were recited at each public service? A child would

see the inconsistency involved, and would detect the erroneous tendency. We are told that "of two hundred and sixty parishes, established in glory in the days of Cromwell, two hundred and forty are now Unitarian," and, sadder still, that the pulpit, from which John Calvin preached to a loving people, now resounds with denials of the Trinity. So long as "the form of sound words" is adhered to, so long will there be very little probability of defection from sound Christian doctrine,—so long will the centrifugal tendency of the sect-system be held in perfect equilibrium by the centripetal force that binds the believer to the great fact of the Incarnation, as beyond all question, that which must never be yielded up even though life itself be the forfeit.

The return to the use of the Creed, not, however, made dependent on the will of the officiating clergyman, but authoritatively required, must, by a natural process, lead to an acceptance of its life and spirit. He, who publicly and with a due sense of its meaning, repeats the article—I believe in the *communion* of saints—must be made to see sooner or later that such communion will not admit of a division of the Church into contending parties, and to feel that existing divisions are wrong and must decrease while the Church itself shall increase.

Liturgical worship not only allows of a more full union, on the part of the people, with the prayers of the minister, but it effectually prevents the injurious effects of any heretical notions he may entertain. The recognition of such will be easy to those who have been trained in forms, prepared in accordance with the early Church customs and formulae. A return to it is a hopeful indication at present. Those, who fear every thing that is Churchly, lest it may be Romanizing, may have their fears dispelled by reflecting on the fact that the practice of the Roman Church, in our country, is to confine the liturgical worship to the clergy and the choir;—these perform the whole service. There is a practical denial of the universal priesthood of believers,—an usurpation of the worship, as absolutely from the hands of the

people, as is the case with some of our most unliturgical sects. The use of liturgical services by people and minister is *not* in accordance with Roman Catholic custom, but is in perfect accord with the custom of the early days of the Holy Catholic Church, even in its apostolic times. Moreover, the employment of the vernacular for this purpose is especially enjoined by St. Paul in his Epistle to the Corinthians, when he exhorts them "to excel to the edifying of the Church," by speaking in "a tongue easy to be understood,"—"Else when thou shalt bless with the spirit, how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned say *Amen* at thy giving of thanks, seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest?" (1 Cor, 14: 16.) In the Roman Church, adherence to the Latin service, and the entire use of Liturgical material by the priest and choir, constitute important differences from the Liturgical worship of such Churches as have, under faithful ministers, well-trained congregations joining, with audible voice, in the responses required by the service, thus satisfying the minister and themselves that their thoughts are not bent on criticizing the prayer but on the contents of the same. The criticism of a rough old soldier, in the Light Artillery of our Army, on the difference between a liturgical form of prayer and one of extempore origin, will show in a word the effect of the two modes of worship on the hearer. The regular Chaplain at the post was in the habit of using the Book of Common Prayer,—being obliged to be absent one Sunday, his place was filled by a brother who rejected all such helps as Liturgies might offer. After service one old soldier expressed himself somewhat as follows:—"I don't like that preacher, for when he says 'let us pray,' he means I will pray and you shall listen, but with the other preacher he means exactly what he says." Here was the difference; in the one case the hearer was obliged to use his intellect, and probably found it difficult to avoid criticizing; in the other he could accompany the minister, who was merely acting as the mouth-piece of the congregation.

But we must draw our article to a close. All mechani-

cal plans at Christian Union, have proven themselves unfitted for the great purpose of binding the *disjecta membra* of the Church. There seems, however, to be hope that such an union will take place; but it must spring from the approximation of religious bodies in life and usages, so that at last, the necessity of separation no longer existing, they must, by a law of their own existence come together and form one harmonious body. To employ the words of an English author: "We can do nothing well till we act 'with one accord'; we can have no accord in action till we agree together in heart; we cannot agree without a supernatural influence; we cannot have a supernatural influence unless we pray for it; we cannot pray acceptably without repentance and confession." Approximation in life and usages must result from a general and devout use of the Creed with the liturgical services that necessarily arise from its employment. Our Churches at present exhibit a great interest in the subject of Liturgies and their uses, and hence we have endeavored to lead our readers to our opinion, that in the *Liturgical tendencies of the Times* there is a faint foreshadowing of future Christian Union. We cannot force the course of History. We must pray and wait. There is a *vis medicatrix ecclesiae*, which will eventually heal all wounds and throw off all excrescences, drive off morbid affections and restore healthy action. We can be as confident that the Actual Church will at one time fully embody the Ideal Church, as that

"The saints on earth and all the dead
But one communion make;
All join in Christ, their living Head,
And of His grace partake."

ART. III.—ANGLO-GERMAN LIFE IN AMERICA.

THE Anglo-German is fast becoming a recognized element in our growing country. It has characteristics peculiar to itself, which will yet go far toward giving tone and color to that general American life in which it is no unimportant part. Long misunderstood and a thousand times abused by what is, to say the least, no better than itself, it is in our day rising to a truer public estimate of its intrinsic worth. We propose to offer for consideration, some reflections on the Anglo-German element, with respect to its characteristics, numerical strength, and probable future influence.

Rationalism or ignorance, transcendentalism or infidelity, fumes from long pipes and lager-beer are the main ideas suggested to the popular mind, when we mention the Germans and their descendants, in relation to our American life.

The glories of the Fatherland are not known to the American public; especially as now inherited by her sons in the truths of the Reformation and the principles of German arts, science and philosophy. These are largely transferred to this land along with her sons. We are liable to forget the full value of the rich inheritance transmitted to us from the Reformation fathers. By some strange power, something like Circean enchantment, not pleasant but still strong, there is a continual tendency to transform the English grown German into a character, with everything but the Yankee left out. Under the pressure of this general force, it soon becomes fashionable to be ashamed, not only of the noble language of the fathers, but also of their simple honesty of character and homely manners. By the prevalence of Yankee customs, moulded by ignorant prejudices, which derisively calls them "Dutchmen," they are foolishly led to ignore, along with the falsely supposed odium that attaches thereto, the true excellencies of their inherent birth-right.

For the bald assumptions of that would be superior intelligence, which ignorantly mistakes German for Dutch, we have no kind of patience. It may be well passed, once for all, with unveiled contempt. But for those, who make a ludicrous merit of bedaubing their ancestry, in accent that should blister their tongues, if it does not mantle their cheeks with the deep stirred blush, by denouncing everything which reminds them of their origin as "too dutch," we have but sovereign pity. We have seen Anglo-Germans, under a false conception of what constitutes the genteel and respectable, with indignant zeal, repelling the imputation that they understood the language of their fathers. We however honored the warm blood that nevertheless gushed at the same time from a German heart, to attest its duty to its original life. The fifth commandment is not considered here in as binding force as it forever should be.

All this, under one view, is natural enough. For though there be nothing in the German character itself, and still less in its noble language, of which its descendants have true cause for being ashamed; yet there are considerations in some sense calculated to give the blush to those who thence derive their origin. Much of this element appears in our American life in its most ungainly dress. Wild radicalism in politics, mystic transcendentalism in philosophy, rationalism and pantheism in religion, are strongly represented by many of those, who have left their country for their country's good. It were a blessing also to the land in which they now sojourn, if they would do as much good for us. But such do not truly represent the general German life. Scum boils naturally to the top, and is always more apparent than the better contents in the vessel below. We are not the advocate or apologist for that kind of German life—the only kind, by the way, with which the public are acquainted.

However apparent are the more repulsive aspects of the Germanic element among our people, so that it is not failed to be noticed, and even grossly exaggerated and most keenly caricatured, there is, nevertheless, a better side.

This there has been but little disposition hitherto shown to appreciate. Some spirits have their type in those unclean birds which delight to be where the carcass is ; while the fresh living forms have no noticeable attraction or desirable value for them. It is a pity when public opinion is made or governed by such.

The true cause for this so common unfavorable view of Germanic life in this country, may, however, be traced far back of the fact itself. First impressions, even though not always correct, yet go far towards making up general conclusions. So doubtless is it largely in this case.

Noticing the ground of this unfavorable judgment, we present it in a twofold form : from which it will be seen how unjust it is, that this should remain now longer in force.

The first reason is found in the native element of the German character itself. It is naturally retiring and modest in its claims to merit. Such are not always the first to be fully appreciated. This commendable virtue, may, however, run, as it oftentimes does, into a serious fault of slow motioned dullness and inactivity ; which, in a fast age like ours is not only offensive, but will also be left far behind the spirit of progress. In strong and sharp contrast with this retiring modesty of the German, is the assuming and always self-sufficient spirit of the Yankee. This is likely in its smart progress to overflow the German at every point. The good natured, easy patience of the Anglo-German has been so long accustomed to submit quietly to this, that it now readily yields to almost any dictation and pretention for the sake of peace.

Germanic life thus often gives way before the absorbing power of a more aggressive spirit, not because it *could not* successfully resist and show a more excellent way. But it would in the main rather suffer from equivocal shrewdness, than meet it on its own grounds, or contend with vamping vanity. Boys trained properly by faithful parents, under such a spirit, had rather not be quite so 'cute, as to allow their smartness to run away with their honest integrity,

and destroy their peace of mind. This spirit would rather be duped than resort to counter humbug in its turn. It never plays, diamond cut diamond. It prefers meerschaum composure, to the necessity of asserting its own personality in violent contests. This fact has crowded the real deserts of the Germans often into the back ground. Such being the plain fact, as resting in the native element of the German character, it need not be a matter of wonder that the rattling car of Yankee activity, drawn by the locomotive of high pressure volition, should make faster time at its break neck speed, than the calm reflective train of German contemplation. Our fathers never sound a steam whistle to tell of their coming, nor do they blow their own horns, as long practiced by others before the invention of the shrill steam signal. We only refer to the fact here without attempting to justify it under all circumstances. This modesty may hide them in a quiet corner when they should be out at work. As illustrating this retiring modesty in an undue sense, a characteristic anecdote is told as follows: A preacher, in a meeting of one of the German sects that despise an educated ministry, while exhorting his hearers to humility, said "My friends—I feel so humble, that it seems to me I am just like, nobody—standing on, nothing—and going to jump, nowhere."

The other consideration to which we refer, as being an original ground for the unfavorable judgment that prevails as against the Germans, is the fact that many of the earlier German settlers, as well as many of the later arrivals, were poor. Many of them were sold into temporary service to pay their passage money. But poverty, says the proverb, is no disgrace, though it be very inconvenient. Then too, from the nature of the case, they were an agricultural people. They dwelt in the country, without public institutions and rattling machinery to call attention to their habitations. In their quiet seclusion they would be naturally overlooked. Their presence and even their very existence was hardly ever noticed in local history. This showed at least their peaceable disposition as citizens. They were

not brawling politicians and place seekers ; but had the happy art of being about their own business—which with other good customs, is fast disappearing. For a long time they had no literary institutions, no periodical organs, no printing presses, and theirs was consequently but a limited literature. Their Bibles they brought with them from home, their prayer books were handed down from father to son in their generations, and Dr. Benjamin Franklin, and after him, Mr. Gruber, printed for them their Catechisms and Almanacs. All this was good as far as it went, but it was inadequate to the increasing wants of their descendants in a fast age and growing country. Doubtless they did not understand enough the use of printer's ink. Lack of progress was a grievous fault, and grievously have our fathers answered it.

Like the burning bush, indeed, has the German element been acted on by other influences, calculated to destroy its life ; yet it is not consumed. This alone, were saying at once much in its behalf. The crusades carried on so long against it, have drawn away much of its own proper material, thus steadily exhausting its life stream. Against this there was, for a great while, no remedy—except in the native vigor, which here and there individually maintained itself in the face of all odds, with the most dogged pertinacity. Having been subject to this constant drain upon its strength, by which other interests have been built up, is it not a wonder that its life is not all gone ?

It is about time, we think, that this thing were brought to an end. The German Churches have at length waked up to the necessity of putting a period to this mode of piracy, by which others have fattened from their strength. That there is yet remaining any of the German element, beyond the generation just arrived in the land, is at least a living monument of its own vigorous original constitution. Make the same draft on any other source of American life; take, for instance, its main stem, that of Puritanism ; and the steady drain for more than a century, would sap it dry to the roots, and a certain death would most inevitably follow.

Only allow yourselves to look at the present case fairly for a moment; and the wonder will not then be, that the German element is not more commanding in public acknowledgment now—but that it exists at all as a living fact. For the last half century or more, others from a stand-point hostile to the German character, have manufactured for it its public opinion; have furnished its school books and general reading matter; have given it its systems of education, and teachers to inculcate their principles; have taken the lead in profitable business; have reaped the reward of German industry; and dictated for the most part, its standard of respectability in their customs, maxims, morals and faith. Children of the Germans subject to such influences from generation to generation, must surely have had an over abundance of native stamina not to have been brought entirely to their style of thinking, saying and doing.

Fashion and popular standards of respectability, as we have already intimated, required in its false conception, that they forsooth, give up the simple customs, rustic manners and rich language of their fathers;—and alas, their religion too, had to be made of an order like that with which they were surrounded. They must under the power of the same false fashion, feign ignorance of anything savoring of German, for fear of being nicknamed Dutch. And few had the courage to meet and endure this. Ridicule is a sharp argument, and with many it prevails. In early youth we remember a woman who would turn up her nose indignantly at certain styles of goods “because they’re too tutch.”

By means of this pressure there has been drawn from the German life and transplanted into other interests, mainly of English Puritanism, its increasing growth, in force sufficient to render large aid to what might otherwise have a less respectable existence. Others may easily excel us now, when they have robbed us of our armour of strength.

The Anglo-Germans noting these facts, are coming now to a consciousness of their own resources, and are turning

hither for the remedy against continued impositions of this kind. Once fairly aroused, you will find the patient endurance of the slow German character covering at the same time, most wonderfully stout powers of resistance. Feeling that they can produce their own business talent, as well as afford the means of trade by their frugal industry, they begin to develop their own resources. Means and ability being present, there is no reason sufficient why their own youth may not become qualified as ministers, teachers, doctors and lawyers, to inculcate, administer and practice the religion, morals, customs and laws of our fathers, as well as form the working bone and sinew of the community.

Look for instance at the vital force the German character reveals. First we have here a physical system capable of great endurance. Its wide, strong chest, large and powerful body, filled with ruddy life, shows the Germanic race to be unsurpassed physically, by any other people. In the German voice there are intonations indicating fulness and strength of character, answering in its rich musical chords to the low melody of the slumbering storm. There is also in it warmth and vigor, revealing the internal depth and manifoldness of the soul-life and mind. No other race have such powers of thought for philosophical investigation.

Purity of the social life, is a marked characteristic among them. High character for chastity as the foundation of conjugal happiness, from the most ancient times, belongs to them. The domestic relations were held inviolate and in most sacred honor. The virtue of their women, secured for them higher respect than was paid to the sex by any other nation. It was not anciently fashionable for them to be any thing else than pure and good. And in our time and country, with all the popular dislikes and prejudices to the contrary, yet are the German girls always, nevertheless, in demand for wives. Their proverbial beauty, health, natural grace, fidelity and domestic economy make them desirable wives, good mothers and queens of

the household for many Englishmen's sons who are ready to change their German maiden names to some of the most pleasant English sounds. "The German woman is all love and gentleness, full of child-like purity, which transports one to Paradise. The English woman, chaste, exclusive, thoughtful, and absorbed in her home affections, so loyal, so firm, and so gentle, is the ideal of a wife. The passion of the Spaniard bites deep into the heart; and the Italian, in her beauty and softness, her warm imagination, often with her touching frankness, renders resistance impossible, and you are enraptured, conquered. However, if you desire a wife whose soul shall respond to your own by the sympathy of intellect as well as love—who shall renew your heart by a charming vivacity and gayety, a helping wit, womanly words, of bird like songs"—you must choose an Anglo-German girl as well trained in the bosom of a happy American home.

Cordial hospitality too, in its simplicity, was a common trait. To their guests, every thing was sacredly free. Not only the results of their industrious hands in their well stored houses, but also of their deep reflective minds. Their systematic thoughts and theories have often been borrowed by the more practical, and applied to Yankee inventions. Contact with the German mind has been of service to others, in more ways than they are ready to acknowledge.

German honesty, is also a characteristic well known, "His word is as good as his bond," is perhaps spoken with more truth of them than of any other class of men. This fact has been illustrated by politicians, who tell the following anecdote: Heinrich owes Wilhelm \$900, to be paid in a year. Having heard of promisory notes, they agree to use one. It was accordingly drawn and signed. Then arose the question who should hold the note till it was fully due. Heinrich thinks Wilhelm ought to have it to show what was due him—but Wilhelm suggests, that as he already knows that, Heinrich should take it so that he would know the time of its payment. This was the course

finally agreed upon; and so Heinrich held his own note till due, when he brought the note and the money and handed them both over to Wilhelm—and there the transaction ended. Who but honest Germans would do that?

Closely allied with their honesty is also their religious character. They have constitutionally a warm and deeply pious life. With them it seldom runs into fanaticism. The Protestant Reformation, let us remind the world, is the birth of this earnest religious life in the German soul. Emancipation of mind and spirit from the despotic thralldom in which it was held for centuries, is due to this outbirth of free thought, proclaiming religious liberty. In no other country could the great Reformation have found all the elements necessary to its success. Men may laugh at what they, in shallow conceptions are pleased to call the vagaries of German transcendentalism; but they are neither as great nor as prolific as the bald isms elsewhere found.

Staid, strong, deep and thorough; calm, modest, just and frugal; industrious, patriotic, warm-hearted, virtuous and religious, are the main characteristics that go to make up the good honest Germans. We cannot but admire them if we once learn to know them. Tacitus, the Roman historian, gives a good account of them already as heathens. Nor has Christianity made them worse. With such traits in the fathers, shall the children in whose veins such blood runs warmly, be mocked into shame at the relationship? Nay, rather let it be cause for honorable joy, that we inherit such virtues.

As more than a full offset to all that we here claim for the German character, the tongue of ignorant ridicule and slanderous detraction, has with much self-complacency been accustomed to lay to their charge the reproach of being "dumb Dutch." The sins of the fathers, in their view, descend to the third and fourth generation—unless the children be driven to renounce all connection with their parentage. It is true, though they are genial and social to a high degree, yet they have not the ready wit and vivacity peculiar to some other nations. There is,

however, genuine German wit. Take for instance the following: Some young bloods bent on sport, passed a German saddler's shop and teasingly called to him through the window, "Helloh, old jarmany! have you got any dog saddles?" "Yea, be sure," he politely answered, "come in, young gentlemen, and try them on."

It were a grievous sin to be truly charged with being opposed to education and true progress. This is laid to the door especially of the Pennsylvania Germans. In a certain sense it is true; but not in the manner and form set forth. New England is in some respects unquestionably far ahead. The German spirit is a slow train. It stands opposed to that kind of progress which is virtually backward, or which runs to ruin and radicalism. It had rather remain in the "old paths" than run into spiritual delusions and infidelity. *Festina lente*, is often the surest speed. To hasten slowly in the end is the best progress. The race is not always to the swift. A conservative element is very desirable, as a check to the wild strides of daring-go-a-head-iveness. Thus we sometimes avoid awful collisions and frightful catastrophies.

It is also true that our Anglo-German communities in the main, felt opposed to the modern common school system, though characteristically did but little to set it aside. They were not opposed to education as such, as has been charged; but against the particular form imposed upon them, they wished to protest. German universities, with their thousands of students—and public schools, after which others model, where all the youth must be taught, are so many arguments to show that the German spirit is in favor of right education.

Long before the godless public schools, with all religion left out, were thought of, in this country our German fathers cherished education. Their school houses and parochial schools along side the church indicated their idea of what the school should be. They wanted real Christian education; if even not so general and thorough it should be of such a character, as not to strike at the foundation

of their customs and religion ; and thus rob them spiritually of their children. Their prejudices became deep seated, and led to stubborn opposition and extreme opposite tendencies.

Back of the present system also we may find some reason for their opposition to the public school. More than a hundred years ago it was designed, through the medium of such schools to steal away the children of the German settlers from the customs, language and religion of their fathers. Against this scheme our sterling fathers set their faces like a flint. Their just indignation has come down to their posterity, traditionally from generation to generation, and has stood in the way, doubtless, of many who might otherwise have received the benefits of a more liberal education. Fidelity to the memory of the past cost the children much, and ran out in fixed opposition to all that looked like a similar attempt. The English colonial authorities are much to blame for the hostility engendered and now existing between the two elements. Had they succeeded, the condition of things, it is true, might have been different ; but would they be better than if allowed to have been directed in a more natural way. The little country churches and school houses adjoining, indicate the simple piety and elementary training adequate to primitive country life. This, however, has lasted too long.

Now the long slumbering giant is about to arouse. We may soon see manifestations of native strength. The Anglo-Germans are not only able but are now becoming willing to foster their own higher institutions of learning. Our Germanic colleges we may not only live to see barely sustained—but like the universities of the Fatherland, crowded with students. Here may yet grow up seats of learning to equal those of the old world. For if everything on this continent is designed by Providence on a grander scale than in Europe, why must we not make these to correspond with all else ?

Here doubtless would be the proper place to speak of the present and prospective strength numerically of the

Anglo-German element. Let us confine this in the estimate to the Germans and their lineal descendants only to the third generation. We do not choose to parade long lines of statistics on this score. It is enough for our purpose to know that the Germans are here in sufficient strength to be reckoned an important element in the components of the whole nation. Germans of foreign birth now living in the different States of the Union, number in round figures a million. Their descendants in the first, second and third generations each, number as many more. So that these form an aggregate of one sixth, or at lowest, one tenth of the whole population of the States.

In making up this rough estimate, we have only to remember that some whole States, as Pennsylvania, and perhaps Wisconsin, are prevaillingly of this class of citizens. Besides, Germans and their descendants are numerous in Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Texas, Virginia, and more or less in all the other States, not excepting those of New England. Nearly all the large cities and towns have from one tenth to one third of their population of the same kind. In the East, in the Middle States, in the great West, and at the far South—all over our mighty country, you will now find the German and his offspring, frugal, industrious and often enterprising. In their settlements, you will always find the fruits of solid worth and economical thrift, which have done more to develop the rich native resources of the land than any other class of citizens. Read the signs of our most substantial business firms, and you will be astonished to find so many of them strongly marked with German characteristics. Many of them, it is true, have lost their primitive form, but you can nevertheless trace them to their origin. Some who are several generations removed, would probably be no little surprised to have the signification of their name given them in English, which is the only tongue in which they could now understand its rendered meaning.

Were anything like an accurate estimate made of the Anglo-German element, it would be astounding to them.

selves—and still more to those who have considered them hitherto as no-bodies—with no stand-point and no tendency. Along with these would be found also many Hugenots, who, having passed first into Germany, finally migrated, as Germans, to this country. In number and influence these are quite respectable. This may help us at least to cultivate self-respect. And if we once come to respect ourselves properly, others will soon learn too to bestow it where it really belongs. The keen-scented politicians already are disposed to acknowledge it.

Short-sighted demagogues, in a truly Know Nothing spirit, for a while did ride the hobby of opposition to the Dumb Dutch. They not only hated the fathers, but could see sourkraut sticking in the children's teeth, to the third and fourth generation. But it is truly wonderfully refreshing to note the change that has come over the spirit of their dream. The newspapers are trying to tickle the intelligent German friends and fellow citizens—so the matter runs—with an acknowledgment that they are the best educated class of men in the land, who understand rational enjoyment, who love liberty, who are exact in dealing, who are honest and reliable for conservatism, and essential to the success of the right party. For the proof, examine almost any of our leading papers.

Whatever we may think of the fact, it is now beyond dispute that Lager and pretzels, by no means depend for their market value alone on Teutonic patronage. And still more be it known, that some even fashionable and respectable (?) people have learned; that, as eating potatoes does not always make an Irishman, so too just as little danger is there of becoming a German, if cheese be a part of the diet—or of being metamorphosed into a full grown Dutchman if they should dine on turkey and sourkraut!

During the past there has been undisguised distrust of German literature. But a marked and favorable change in its behalf is now rapidly going on. German learning is now an acknowledged and felt mental power in the general life of our country. Its salutary influence is held in

high respect and honor, wherever rightly known. The prevailing sentiment is certainly not that of its former hostility.

Every one pretending to the rank of a true scholar, must now cultivate an acquaintance more or less thorough with German authors in the main departments of science. Wherever the German mind comes into contact with earnestness in others, it starts inquiry, it awakens thought, it invigorates mental life. It is now in its best sense, working wonders in this country.

Much of Germany's best products has been transferred to our soil. In all the broad fields of varied science, are found these contributions of ripe scholarship, taking high rank. Nor are they more prolific than exhausting in their fulness of research. Metaphysics here finds a solution for its profoundest problems. The hidden depths of philosophy have been fathomed, as no where else besides. Theological science owes much to the bright genius of the German divines. The true faith with them has more than mastered the rationalism of the age. It has checked the bold advance of infidelity that for a while threatened the world. The orthodox teachers combatting successfully the false spirit of the times, have won trophies for the truth, which the world is glad to acknowledge and admire.

Results like these, cannot be long overlooked by any honest seeker after truth. No man, we may say broadly, can grapple with the earnest and profoundly significant problems of the age, with any tolerable show of mastery, who has not armed himself with the best provided means of defense. Philosophical and theological truth finds its best weapons, stamped with the impress of German mind. Some of the greatest inventions too of modern times, we inherit also from the same source. The Queen of the arts, the art of printing, and book making belongs to Germany as the land of books. In fact it is the home originally, not only of many sterling citizens of this Union, but also of many of our other blessings. Its poetry and music is now largely transferred to this land of the free; where its Aesthetical

products in the original and in translations more or less excellent, are moulding the tastes of thousands. The same remark is also true of the best works we have on theology—in exegesis, dogmatics, polemics, and history. The foreign theological library published by the Messrs. Clark of Edinburgh, Scotland, it is worthy of remark, is without exception, translations from the German. From no other, has there yet been a book found worthy a place in the series. So too, the best works we have on criticism, history of philosophy, philosophy of history, antiquities, and the like, are derived from the same quarter.

Knowing such facts as these, it is a plain duty, to make some proper account of this German element in American life. If it be true that our country, as has been supposed, is to be the grand theatre, on which, the errors wearing the grey marks of centuries, are to be met and vanquished, how immensely important then is it not, that we be furnished with the best means for success. The superficial and ignorant, who are ashamed to use the Germanic element of strength may be all the more easily met and overcome. For no vain purpose assuredly, has Divine providence concentrated here so powerful an element as that we are now considering.

Very properly, we may be allowed to say here, most distinctly, that we would not be understood as claiming in any way for this German element anything like a clanish character. It should by no means be kept apart from the other elements of our nationality, as a separate item by itself for independent purposes. Any such selfish idea, and any movement looking in this direction, we conceive to be both false and wrong. To try to effect this, would be to betray the whole interest. Should it unfortunately be led to do so, it would find itself shorn of its locks, and bound by its enemies, for certain doom in the grinding mill.

Nay: its strength lies not in a life separate from the general body. Just as little will it be able thus to be useful, as its misguided enemies are able to destroy it entire-

ly. Neither is its mission, to Germanize the United States,—even were this within the reach of its possible power. They greatly err, therefore, who either vainly suppose, or teach, or practice, as its best means for self-preservation and effective influence, the necessity of the German arraying itself against the English in a hostile attitude. Rather in the bosom of a common life, formed by the harmonious and free blending of all the elements entering into our American society, are the German and English, to find their congenial union. This is at once true for the social, political and religious life.

Untold self-inflicted wrong then does the German suffer, if lead by some demagogue, who would be a champion in Church or State, it refuses stubbornly to form a free union with the general life. By such a union, it by no means loses its distinctive power and beneficial influence. We want the German spirit to be an acknowledged constituent in the American life. Of course, where the other elements do not so acknowledge this as a proper and important part of the whole, their must be collision, more or less violent before a union can at all take place.

Plain illustrations of this are found in communities and Churches. Where the two elements have been at war, under the false impression that there were two opposite interests to subserve, neither has prospered as they might have done in full harmony. Nor are their results in the sum what they would have been in real union for mutual support.

Just let us note, that language and spirit may be distinguished. Cases may occur, for instance (as practically they often do occur,) where the contest is between the two tongues more than anything else. The English is, and of course will be, the recognized language of the land. In this the laws are made and administered. The public schools too are mainly in this dress. Though in them may be taught Latin, Greek, French and German, still they are prevailing, and very properly too, English. But though

the German language must be mainly given up in the second and third generations, and no longer authoritatively used; yet the spirit and life may remain as strong as before, and be cherished for its excellent virtues. The question then practically forces itself home to the Germans and their descendants—Whether they had not better give up the language, where historical necessity makes the demand, and retain the genial spirit, than be driven to a war of extermination, and being inevitably fought down, sooner or later, lose all? It is well to make terms with the adversary while in the way.

This Anglo-German literature, science, philosophy, theology and poetry, of which we have spoken, is working its way powerfully into the life and habits of the land. While it remained purely German, all must see that it must of necessity have remained at the same time circumscribed in the limits of its influence and results. But to do its best work it also must become Anglo-German, i. e., it must drop the German language, retaining, however, its spirit. It is not every man, though he even love the German language, who would threaten to attain a knowledge of it, at the expense of all the hair on his head, (as we once heard one say,) in order that he might commune with German minds.

Dr. Rauch's great influence as a philosopher, does not lie in his deep cherished love for the German language exclusively; still less was its peculiar strength found in ignoring that altogether, and turning thoroughly English. But rather he becomes greatest, in giving the combined results of both brought together in a living harmony—though perforce it was in an English dress. To write in English, successfully, with all the advantage of a German standpoint is then possible. This is much better than translations. But even these, if tolerably well rendered, are of great service to the English student. Anglo-German is practically better, than is either, separately considered.

Had Dr. Schaff, as some desired, undertaken, as a theologian, to Germanize the Church in this country, it must

have resulted in a most signal failure. So will all such efforts in less able hands, a fortiori, always prove. Or, had he become so fully English as to lose sight altogether of the German, he might have given us, as puny results as the dwarfed things we meet elsewhere. He is certainly a more brilliant scholar, leaving altogether out of view his greater usefulness, by being Anglo-German, than if only one of these.

Then look again at the astonishing results of the German element in harmonious contact with the English mind. Take, for instance, what Dr. Nevins in the English tongue has given us from a German stand-point. He might have been great, after the order of Presbyterian greatness, even among their greatest minds, without the additions he obtained from Germanic culture. But when he made the vast lore of that broad field also his own, this element infused into his extraordinary powers of mind a giant strength, by the force of which he towers aloft, head and shoulders, above any living American mind. In after years, when they shall repeat "the few immortal names that were not born to die," his shall be mentioned with the remark, that there were "giants in those days." Perhaps the time is not far distant, when it will be considered one of his most lasting glories, that he taught us to value aright the significance and importance of the German element in our ecclesiastical life. Largely what we are, we owe to him.

It is wonderful what a force is acquired in the Anglo-German combination. Retaining for the most part its original German depth, inwardness and thoroughness, it secures also the vigor, activity and executiveness of the English. It is not a small contribution Germany thus makes to American life. At the same time, it is worthy of remark, that there is a wonderful affinity in the American mind for German thought. It is ripe to receive products of this kind. Could this be infused into New England Puritanism, it would serve to complete its many excellencies. A mighty revolution it would bring about in our land.

its character—not in the way of Germanizing it do we mean; but by giving it an element of positiveness in faith and philosophy, which would fill a felt want in their eviscerated systems of thought. Error and infidelity are making sad havoc of their orthodoxy. There is a loud call for something to check these inroads made upon their materialistic faith. In the German element of this country, we believe, there is the needed remedy.

You have in your very midst, one who was converted to the Christian faith, from the ranks of New England skepticism, by being providentially brought into contact with the theology of our Church, as represented by Dr. Nevin. Add there are many such whose hungry souls cry for that better bread. They have gone from their eastern homes into the broad west; where, tired of the emptiness of an emasculated system of doctrine, they must become infidel, if not rescued by a positive teaching that offers real contents for faith. Already do we see evidences of this, in the hearty responses of earnest souls, that welcome the truth. If we are true to our mission, many in the wide west, the future of America and the world, will feel the blessed influence of positive faith brought to bear upon them. Our stand-point must in the end command the rank of high respectability.

Our literary institutions of Anglo-German spirit bring telling influence to bear on American life. The institutions at Mercersburg and Lancaster are strong; powerfully affecting the literary and theological life of the land, because they combine these elements of strength. Heidelberg may gain strength in the same way. Any attempt, however, to make it exclusively one sided, will cripple its usefulness in the great work. Besides ours, other institutions are also making more account of the German as a complement to the English, than formerly. Gettysburg has founded a German Professorship. Princeton and Andover also are drawing strength from German thought and mind.

Not only in our own land, but also in England and

Scotland, learned men are beginning to know and appreciate the advantage to be gained from this source. If thought rules the world, certainly the solid phalanx of homely truth produced by the German mind will go largely towards modifying this power. It is already acknowledged, in the fear, that has arrayed other systems against it. While it overwhelms those empirical and shallow systems of materialism, it brings its own antidote for rationalistic heresies, and transcendental nonsense. That it is a power is beyond dispute. The problem now is, to turn it to the best advantage of our American nationality.

Blinded prejudice may ignorantly deny the just merits of the element under consideration. Presuming upon itself estimated superiority, it may proudly refuse the girdle of strength, which the German element brings to its aid. The contest with error may be vauntingly undertaken, unconscious of the weakness of empty pride and vanity. It is, on the other hand, just as foolishly unbecoming to make too much account separately, of this one interest, in our domestic, literary, and religious life, or in the civil polity of the country. Without at all undervaluing other great interests held in common, we may, however, simply claim for this one important element such just consideration, as shall honestly note its virtues, acknowledge its strength and rightly direct its influence. This much at least our self-respect and self-preservation requires.

Wherever it prevails, it may easily be distinguished by its own peculiarities. Those who want to find it, will see it in the names of our people, in their peaceable lives, in the well tilled land, substantial barns, comfortable houses, good plain manners, simple honesty, industrious thrift, and domestic happiness that mark their homes. There health, wealth and prosperity abound: and with few artificial wants, they are for the most part, in their Christian homes, neat churches, and parochial schools, heartily content. Here is a fountain, whence streams of influence, in its happy homelife, rich literature, and higher institutions of learning, will flow in unobtrusive silence, refreshing and gladdening our land.

Like the streams that irrigate the valleys in the dry summer, along whose courses the green growths show a life-giving freshness, flowing silently—so let our lives be, in the great American nationality. You will find that it is a grand thing to be young men, living in the age and land in which we dwell. We trust you will be so trained in this institution, that you will imbibe the best results of the Anglo-German mind. Make then, its sound philosophy, its pure morality, and its true faith, be in the affairs of life, a sure pledge of glorious triumph.

G. B. R.

ART. IV.—FAITH AND KNOWLEDGE.

It is said to be a fact, well established by trial and experience, that no college or university has ever been known permanently to flourish without having been under the care and control of some branch of the Christian Church, or at least under the guardianship of Christian men.* We find, too, that smaller literary institutions are generally established and conducted by Christian men. Our State Normal Schools also find it necessary to recognize Christianity, at least so far as to keep up public prayers and the reading of the Holy Scriptures. Even our Common Schools, though the State recognizes religion only in the most general way, feel themselves constrained under the pressure of the Christian spirit, in many things to honor Christianity. All this indicates most clearly the prevailing feeling that mind *alone* cannot be recognized in education;

* The celebrated University of Virginia, which in its first intention was to exist on a basis which entirely excluded Christianity, though enjoying the richest State beneficence and influence, has been compelled to change its character, in order to raise it from the effete state into which it had sunk.

but that the heaven that must work in all life, the salt of the earth which alone can purify and preserve, the light of the world from which all else is bright only by reflection, is deeply felt to underlie all mental vigor and development.

It must be evident to every reflecting mind that the religious element must underlie the true development of our entire human life. If this is not a necessity, then Christianity can not be what its very nature implies—the first, deepest and ultimate need of man—that which even heathen endeavors, however unconsciously and blindly, show to be regarded by man in his earnest moods as his most absorbing concern—that which no denial or ignoring of its claims has ever succeeded in irradiating from human consciousness.

Man is a unit—a single whole; but his unity of being is made up of three departments: physical, intellectual, and moral—body, soul, and spirit. By means of his body he is allied to earth, the physical world, through the senses; which is his lowest side. By means of his spirit he is allied to the supernatural, spiritual world, through his spiritual faculties, or senses; this is his highest side. Between these two lies and acts the soul, allied to both. This triune view of our nature corresponds with man's original creation from earth up, as to his body, from heaven down as to the image of God in which he was made, and the breath of life by which he became a living soul. It is the view which pervades the entire thinking of St. Paul—which is found in the teachings of the Fathers*—and which characterizes all modern Christian philosophy.

Now, this being the true view of man, it is clear that the highest is the controlling side of man's nature, and that from it must come the power of elevation to the lower. The true development of our life, therefore, requires its

* "There are three things whereof man consists, spirit, soul, and body; which again are called two, because often the soul is named together with the spirit; for a certain reasonable part of the same, which beasts are without, is called the spirit: that which is chief in us is the spirit; next, the life whereby we are joined unto the body, is called the soul; finally, the body itself, since it is visible, is that which in us is last."

Augustine's *Short Treatises*, pp. 33, 34.

basis to be laid in the spirit—in other words, it must begin in religion.

Thus we get to the root of a most fundamental and pernicious error in regard to the true principle of education. That which elevates mind above spirit, puts knowledge before faith;* thus separating knowledge from faith; whereas faith goes always before knowledge, underlies it, and is its true mother, according to that profound motto of St. Anselm: "*Neque enim quaero intelligere ut credam, sed credo ut intelligam.*" I do not seek to know that I may believe, but I believe that I may know. We become first good, and then wise. Goodness is greater than wisdom—and what passes for wisdom, when not under the control of goodness, is nothing but a gilded vanity, or, if we may so say, a splendid sin. "The fear of the Lord is the *beginning* of wisdom." This is a divine principle which stands forth as a bold and immovable rock legitimating and vindicating itself as truth in the history of human development—a monumental column in honor of religion in the world's intellectual and spiritual progress, rendered more sublime and alone by the wrecks of broken systems which lie scattered around it.

As the principle that Christianity must underlie all mental development, that faith must precede knowledge as its mother and nurse, strikes at the root of every false system and idea of education, it is worth our while to endeavor to set this truth in a clear light before us, by pursuing a line of argument and illustration by which it may be most firmly and incontestably established.

We begin by founding an argument on the relation already indicated of spirit and soul in the constitution of our nature. We have said, in a general way, that the spirit, the higher, controls the soul beneath it. But we make this clearer by noticing the ruling faculties of each. The

* It will of course be understood that we do not refer to merely historical faith, but to subjective faith in the form of repose, trust, reliance, confidence, which is in us the active appropriating organ by which our union with the saving life of Christianity is effected, and the objective supernatural power of salvation is actually made our own.

will is the ruling power in the spirit, and sovereign over the whole man. The will is moral, not intellectual. This is evident at once from the fact that persons of very inferior intellect, or intellectual development, are often found to have stronger and better wills than others of stronger and more cultivated intellects. The will is the master motive power, and acts alike to impel men in the right or in the wrong, in truth or in error, in the evil or in the good. Hence the will controls the understanding—is its master, and it rules according to its own character—if good, for good; if evil, for evil. The will, though fallen, is still the sovereign; and if not first set right by grace, will sink the whole realm of being over which it presides down to its own degraded level.

We have said that the will is moral, not intellectual. We now add that the understanding is intellectual not moral. It has no power whatever to command the moral. How often do we find that the understanding sees the right, when it has no power at all to bias or bend the will in its favor. All men know better than they find the moral power to do. The intellect that sees the light, still needs the master will to direct and impel toward it. No improvement of the intellect can, of itself, in the least strengthen the power of the will for moral purposes. The most exalted intellects the world has ever known, have been, in all endeavors after moral control and elevation, as a man without nerves. The will made healthy by grace, alone is that self-determining power, in which man's individuality and freedom centre. This is the sovereign on the throne of our entire being, reigning with undisputed sway over all the faculties of the mind and members of the body. Here then must begin all elevation—an elevation that has, and must have, its basis in grace, not in nature,—in faith, not in knowledge. Upon this Hermon-summit of our nature must the vivifying showers from still higher sources first of all descend, before streams of life and refreshing can flow down into the vallies, and run among the hills of the intellectual and physical realms which lie on a lower range of our being.

Thus, then, that which is highest and first in our nature, must be highest and first in its education and proper development. Faith must underlie and precede knowledge.

An examination of the manner in which the human spirit is actually developed from infancy up to the fullest self-conscious perfection illustrates and proves the same relation as existing between faith and knowledge. Take a child. How is its nature developed? What is the process, what the order, and what the history of its development? Does not that part of its nature which more directly and most deeply forms the basis for religion, mature and show itself active first? Is it not the habit of its spirit to believe what it does not, and cannot as yet understand? Are not dependence and repose in others its earliest activities? Is not the whole bias of its training such as cultivates first of all dependence, trust, faith?—and is not this so necessarily and properly? Could it be otherwise? Would its constitution, and its relation to others, make any thing else possible? Certainly not.

Moreover, how beautiful is the life of childhood in this very habit of implicit trust where it does not, cannot as yet understand. In regard to the needs of its physical life it follows instinct, not knowledge; and in regard to its higher interests it believes and acts on authority and not on understanding. As little as it can know how its life is fastened to and bound up with, the maternal bosom on which it hangs, in such trusting and satisfied dependence, so little can it know, by any intelligent apprehension and conviction, the reason and ground on which rest those teachings which give bent and bias to its spirit, and determine its thoughts, habits, and life. It grows a parasite on the parental stem—looks to them, and trusts in them. It learns first to believe and confide—it will learn later to understand and know. So clear, so proper, and so beautiful is this, that according to our Saviour's deep words, even such as have attained to any degree of self-conscious intellectual maturity outside of the power and grace of religion, and without its pre-bias, and have thus left faith behind in their devel-

opment, must undo their life, count what was gain to them as loss, and receive the kingdom of God as a little child. They must become fools that they may become wise. They must become as babes that they may first of all receive the sincere milk of the truth, and thus pass forward according to the true order and in harmony with the true laws of spiritual development, from faith to knowledge.

Thus in the very constitution of our being, and in the order of our development as it there lies, we behold incontrovertible evidence that the cultivation of our religious nature must underlie that of our intellectual nature, and that thus faith is in order before knowledge.

We are led to the same conclusion by a view of the relation which Christianity has sustained and does still sustain to intellectual development in the world's history as a whole. As we have found that faith is before knowledge in the order of individual development, so we find that Christianity also precedes it in the intellectual development of the race.

That Christianity is the light of the world our Saviour has pointedly asserted; but history most clearly confirms His divine words. Civilization is not first, and unto Christianity; but the reverse. The history of missions, both ancient and modern, have established the fact that the method of success among the heathen, is not by the endeavor first to educate intellectually and civilize, but that these are results and fruits of their being won to simple faith and submission to the Gospel of Christ. All attempts to prepare them for faith in Christ by preparatory mental culture has been lost time and failure. The faith finds lodgment in pagan hearts, and indeed in all hearts, as good news, simply announced for faith, and commended to every man's conscience and sense of want. Self-conscious knowledge must grow forth from this germ. Though the history of missions has forced this truth upon the most earnest minds, yet are many slow to learn it; because the error which prevails mostly in practice, rests on

the same popular mistake which underlies the wide-spread false ideas of education now in vogue, and arises from the unchurchly and unsacramental spirit of the age. Men will still seek to educate nature into grace, instead of seeking to sanctify and glorify nature in grace; thus ever putting first what God has put last.

Nothing is more clearly decided by the testimony of history than that Christianity is the mother and nurse of science. Colleges and universities are a fruit of its growth, not its cause. The highest philosophy is Christian philosophy. The highest poetry is Christian poetry. The highest order of music is sacred music. So of painting, sculpture and architecture. So of history. What comparison is there between history in which the divine factor is most prominent, and that in which the human factor prevails. What a dignity, elevation, and glory has Christian as compared with pagan history!

Does any one think of Greece and Rome as furnishing examples of civilization, intellectual elevation, and historic glory independently of Christianity? We answer, Have not time and truth shown all these achievements to have been without the element of true life and permanency? The nations sank under them, and, with its empty glory, faded away. Grecian beauty was as the beauty of a bubble, and Roman power as the arch of a bubble, unsustained by heart or centre; both broke and vanished. It was the glory of a whitened sepulchre; deadness was within even while there was beauty without. As there was no true life, there has been, there can be, no resurrection. Nor did it die as the seed dies, by giving life to a greater and better than itself. From its ruins, Christianity rose in the vigor of a new creation. It has redeemed the human spirit from the polished tomb to which Grecian and Roman civilization and science had consigned it. It has taught the nations to yield to the moulding power of a unity and a progress, higher, broader, and more permanent than nationalities; and has carried away victoriously the history of the world after the cross of Jesus Christ!

How plainly does this show that Christianity alone gives vigor to science, civilization, and history—alone sanctifies these, and elevates them to their high and noble ends.

Every theory of education that does not make Christianity its main basis must be false, because it overlooks the fact that man is a *fallen* being—having a depraved nature—by reason of which his entire spirit has a false bias, and his whole intellectual nature is brought under false tendencies. Hence Christianity presents a theory of education peculiar to itself. It does not allow for a moment the idea that the mere development of our nature as it is, can be of any advantage to us, or that we can attain the true ends of our being by merely natural helps. It proposes the education of man in grace. Hence the commission to teach the nations is given to the Church. Before our Saviour authorizes any one to “feed His lambs” or “feed His sheep” He first asks him with repeated emphasis, and with searching solemnity, “Lovest thou me?” Through the entire Epistles of the New Testament are testimonies the most earnest against the wisdom which is merely of this world and carnal in its basis; and they are, in their entire spirit, a commentary on the words: “The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom.” (Cor 1. 19-21)

Nothing can perhaps better illustrate the one-sidedness and false character of merely secular education than the etymology and radical meaning of the words by which it is commonly designated.

Consider the word education. It is derived from *educō*, to draw out. To draw out what? That which is in man. But what is in man naturally? A depraved nature—prone to evil. To draw out, and develop that, is to create a greater evil. “Educated nature is educated vice.”

The old prejudice against education—so largely attributed to the Germans,—that education makes only greater rogues, is in fact a deep truth as directed against education which has not the life of Christianity underlying it. Our fathers who shared this sentiment were far from being op-

posed to education as such. They loved an educated ministry, and had profound respect for educated men in the literary professions, and in the service of the State. But it was education sanctified by the Christian life, and consecrated to high, honest, and honorable ends, which they honored with a deference not a whit behind that of any people.

But they saw, too, that, when religion did not underlie education, then the smarter the man the greater the rascal, and the more dangerous his influence. Were they not correct? Are there not thousands who would do less mischief if they knew less? The fact is, the development of a natural man's intellectual nature is the mere increase of an evil power in his hands. "Knowledge is *power*"—nothing more—it is not goodness, not piety—it is mere *power*, power for good or power for evil, according to the spirit of him who wields it. It can defend the right better; it can also defend the wrong better. It can more powerfully influence others for good, but also for evil. It will enable him the better to preach a sermon, or deliver an infidel lecture. It will fit him to manage well a business, or to manage well a defalcation. It prepares him well to count, or well to counterfeit. Do we not clearly see that the mere drawing out of his intellectual powers is the mere development of a fearful power in man; it is a glorious power, only when the Christian life underlies and directs it. Would it not have been better for the world if such men as Paine, Voltaire, Rousseau, and scores of others, had never learned the alphabet; and are there not men around you who are only the worse for their smartness?

It is not mere education we want, but Christian education—not educated men but educated Christian men. But how can you have these unless you make the Christian life and spirit the basis of all mental development? Blame not honest Christian men, as our fathers were, for being unfavorable to that mere secular education, which on a natural basis, and by mere human appliances, nurses depraved natures into smarter human devils—which only enables

them the better to make counterfeit notes, quack medicines, wooden nutmegs and wooden hams, and in general to inaugurate subtle schemes of fraud and rascality. Educate men in grace, instead of in nature—make provision for the spirit as well as for the intellect in your schools—let Christ, and Paul, and John, be heard, as well as Masters of Arts; let there be praying as well as parsing—let the language of Canaan be taught as well as the language of Homer and Virgil—let the Holy Spirit breathe in and around the teacher and the taught as well as the spirit of science—and good men, however uneducated themselves, will hurry their sons and daughters to your Halls of learning.

Again, it is called *training* the mind. But this represents merely the appliance of outward care—as that which is done to vines, plants, and trees by pruning and directing the growth. But this does not at all reach the depth of the want. It takes for granted that the natural growth and development is good and needs only outward regulation. But here an unchristian basis is assumed. The evil nature of man is overlooked. Can you cultivate grapes by training thorns, or figs by pruning thistles. So, can you truly educate an evil nature into a good and fruitful life by mere outward training. Samson's locks may be cut, but thereby the strength of his nature is not rooted out, nor the vigor exhausted by which his hair will grow again. You may bind the man possessed among the tombs with withes and chains, but the maniac strength within him is not subdued by such outward regulation. So you may trim, and regulate, and train, by outward educational appliances, the natural man, but you reach not the seat of the want, nor secure his true development. You may train evanescent graces to cover the evil beneath, as flowery vines grow over ruins—but the ruins are beneath nevertheless, and only, by being covered, a better abode for hissing and horrid creatures.

How inadequate is the idea as it underlies the word *training* to represent the true, full idea of Christian education. What a false idea of education does it cover! And

how clear is it that an element far deeper than it recognizes is needed in the true development of our nature. It is the Christian element that is wanting.

We have also the word *teaching*, as representing what is needed in our mental development. This is the mere presentation of truth and duty to the mind of another. This is as if giving water and air to a plant were sufficient without any reference to the life of the plant itself, and the soil in which it is to grow. Something must precede teaching. Hence our Saviour, commissioning His disciples, instructs them first to "make disciples" of them, and then teach them. Of what use are precepts where there is neither the will nor the power to practice them; as little use, yea, as real an injury, as the communication of food is to a stomach which has not the power to digest and assimilate.

Even so far as teaching can call forth action from the taught it can only be of the kind and character of the teacher, as water only rises to a level with its source—the teaching making the pupil good or bad as it itself is. If he is taught error he is made worse; and if he is taught truth, there is no power in that teaching itself to dispose him toward it, or to give him the power to use it as a blessing to himself or others. No amount of knowledge imparted can become a means of grace; and is consequently no power to elevate or unfold a fallen nature. To expect true light and life from mere intellectual communion is as superficial as to look for light and warmth from a moon when no sun shines upon it. As Christ is the light of the world, so Christianity is the sun, of which all the light of science is mere reflection. Only children regard the lights in the calm lake as true suns and stars—those who have put away childish things know that the true lights shine from the pure heaven above, and from earth the reflection.

Equally inadequate is the word *instruction*—which means to build up knowledge in the mind—to deposit its materials there as in stores. By this process a mind may be put in the same case as a man over-loaded with wealth, who is only the more useless to others, and the more miserable to himself, on that account.

The mind is not a dead store-house, divided into departments or granaries, each ready to be filled with its appropriate stores; and education is not merely the building in of these stores of knowledge. The human life is an organism; and the proper design of education is to strengthen that organism, and promote its healthy action. A mere building into this organism may hinder instead of promoting its action. By mere instruction the deep real want of the human spirit is far from being met.

Now whilst in the true idea of Christian education all these conceptions are comprehended—so that there is a drawing out, or *education*; a *training*, as by outward regulation and care; a *teaching*, as by outward presentation and communication to the mind; and *instruction*, as by filling the mind with stores of knowledge—yet, there is also underlying these, and working beneath and in them, that which characterizes true Christian education, and which is truly and beautifully expressed by the word *NURTURE*, as used by Paul, when he enjoins that children be brought up “in the *nurture* and admonition of the Lord.”

Nurture is what the soil, moisture, air, and sunlight are to the plant; what the maternal bosom, and the life and spirit of the family are to the infant what the ordinances, means of grace and communion of the Church, are to the growing Christian. Nurture is that silent, unseen, gradual, but powerful effect produced by the surrounding spiritual atmosphere, in which the pupil lives, breathes, and is healthy—an air embosoming teacher, pupil, books, science, study and recreation—the unseen life and spirit of an Institution. This atmosphere, this spirit and life which nurtures, must be Christianity—underlying, and breathing in all education, training, teaching, and instruction, leavening them all into its own form and spirit, pervading them all with divine vigor, and sanctifying them all to high and holy ends. This is the only leaven that can transform, the only salt that can savor and preserve the high intellectual interests of the world, and sustain and promote true civilization; for “civilization is but Christianity applied to society.”

The first and most important office of education is to give the pupil the right *position*—till he attain this, all his development is but entanglement and confusion. He must see the unity and harmony of science. But where is its unity except in Christ? in whom are hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. Only He who made the world, is the Revealer of its mysteries. The eternal Word must be first heard. Where is the harmony of science, but in the spirit of Christianity, which makes all things one, by subordinating all to Christ, who is the true head of all things to the Church, and to whom the smallest wonders of science, the worm, the blade, the rock, even as the cherub nearest the throne—must ascribe all wisdom and glory, forever.

It would be an easy thing to show that the principle of faith enters into all science as its ultimate basis. Philosophy, natural science, astronomy, even the exact science of mathematics—all must at last *assume* their first and deepest principles. With nothing does the teacher find it more necessary to make his pupil better acquainted than with axioms and postulates. This is the hard-pan which lies at last under all our tilling; and the teacher who would proudly spurn the idea that Christian faith must underlie knowledge, must at last quiet the Why? the How? and the What? of his earnest pupil, by the answer "So it is—an axiom, a postulate—self-evident truth—to be believed, not understood. Believe this and you shall understand the rest." How little we know! and what we do know, we know because we have believed something else first. Thus science, when we have followed it to its ultimate principles directs us to faith as its own last ground—points to faith as the highest reason, and to Christianity as the mother and nurse of all true knowledge.

Have we fairly shown, by various modes of argumentation and illustration, that Christianity cannot be sundered from the interests of mental development—then, what God has joined together let not man put asunder.

In calling attention to this subject we have not been beating the air. The popular idea of education at present rests

on the theory that mind alone can be properly treated in the matter of education. The secular element predominates in our schools; and the intellectual development of man, it is professed, will usher in the golden age of national and social advancement. This theory with its manifest tendencies, gives us no such hope, but on the contrary fills us with inexpressible fear! We fear power, any kind of power, even the divine power, when we see not behind it, and in it, grace mercy, and love. Education is power; and we dread it when it is unsanctified by religion, and wielded by spirits unrenewed in grace, and unconsecrated by the spirit of our holy Christianity. The iron horse, with bowels of fire, ribs of steel, and neck of thunder, is a pride and a glory *on the track*—but a ruinous demon *beside it*. Knowledge when it bows to Jesus Christ, and walks in His ways is an angel of light; when it rejects Him, and walks in its own ways, it is a rebel, like any other angel that stands not in its true estate, whose home and doom is the pit.

Dark are the shadows, which still lie and move on the earth, of "clouds without water carried about of winds." Many still are the "trees whose fruit withereth." But history will yet justify herself to her children, and evermore call back the earnest inquirer to principles which in his first essay he has overlooked, and passed by. The human mind, and those who have its development in charge, will yet discover the true steady beacon amid the "raging waves" and the "wandering stars" which toss about and mislead the pilots of human thought. Jesus Christ is still in the schools, "in the midst of the doctors, both hearing them, and asking them questions." Teachers will sooner or later yield suitable reverence to the words of the Word, and to the truths of the Truth. They will yet learn to believe that they may know; and approaching the great and solemn problems of science with an ear open to His words, and a heart in sympathy with His Spirit, they will be both delighted and "astonished at His understanding and answers."

Lancaster, Pa.

H. H.

ART. V.—THE IDYLS OF THEOCRITUS.

THE pastoral poetry of the ancient Greeks, we confess, is of a humble order. To the high ideal in art it makes no pretensions. It does not often, as does the grander Epos and tragedy, from the far back heroic times of legend and fable, draw its imaginary scenes, but takes them generally from nature as seen abroad in daily life. To almost super-human beauty or grandeur, fashioned forth from the poet's imagination, it does not seek to give "a local habitation and a name," but rather, like the new comedy, tries to hold the mirror up to nature and "catch the manners living as they rise." Indeed even than comedy it is less artistic and ideal. Not being intended for representation on the stage, it has less plot and fewer incidents. In truth its whole scenes are generally nothing more than a set of simple dialogues between shepherds vying with each other in their musical abilities, having now and then a short narrative thrown in between as explanatory, and sometimes placed before them, as a prologue, some descriptive verses. In this way these pastorals, more than does any other species of poetry to be met with in Grecian literature, come to resemble in some places that kind of modern poetry called the Descriptive. Indeed what Theocritus intended his to be, and what they really are, can be seen from the title which he has placed before them. He has called them *Idyls*, meaning thereby pictures or images. They are graphic descriptions of life and manners, the scenes of which are not always laid among the mountains of his native Sicily, nor are they confined wholly to his own times. Of city life besides he has given us some vivid and amusing representations, as it was to be met with among the middling classes of his day, especially at their great festivals; and once or twice has he thrown his scenes far back into the old heroic times of adventure and glory, thus investing them with an ancient charm which makes us feel while

reading them, in each case, as if we had really fallen all unexpectedly upon some hallowed fragment of a lost epic.

But, though bucolic poetry of any description, as we have just said, belongs not properly to the high ideal in art, yet the pastoral life of ancient Sicily, on account of its charming scenery and classical associations, so far surpassed that of any country in modern times, that in comparison it seems almost of itself to rise into a poetic sphere approaching very nearly the high ideal, at any rate in rural life. Of the fertile soil and varied climate of that island, who has never heard? To say nothing of Hybla, full of bees, and other celebrated mountains in it, who has not been charmed with what travelers tell us about mount Aetna? Around its base and up its sides for some twelve or fifteen miles, they say, are ever blooming the trees of the tropics, the palms and aloes, the grape vines and olive and orange trees. Here are ever heard the buzzing of bees, the cooing of doves and the serenades of nightingales. Ascending from these, the adventurer comes into a more temperate clime, and feels cooler breezes, as upwards, for some seven or eight miles further, he wends his way beneath venerable oaks, and chesnuts, and beeches, and lastly under the firs and pines. Here often is the squirrel seen peeping out from the branches above, and the rabbit and partridge scudding away beneath. In both these regions, the tropical and temperate, are extended the richest pastures and most magnificent park-like scenery. Above these to its bleak summit, a thousand feet, rises sublimely the snowy region.

Beside the fine natural scenery, however, showing itself every where throughout the whole island, in olden times were also many consecrated spots, scenes of stories and legends told by the ancient poets, which could still be pointed out, and with which the Sicilian shepherds were as familiar as with household words. Out from Aetna in the sea, were still conspicuously to be seen the famous rocks which Polyphemus had hurled after the retreating ships

of Ulysses. Near Syracuse was still gushing up the renowned fountain augmented by the enamored flood of

"Divine Alpheus, who by secret sluice,
Stole under seas to meet his Arethuse;"

and in the vale of Enna, were still blooming the distinguished meads beside the yellow fields beloved and frequented by Demeter, where her daughter Persephone,

"gathering flowers,
Herself, a fairer flower, by gloomy Dis,
Was gathered."

Then had the shepherds legends of their own, not as yet to be met with in any of the books. They knew, for instance, all about the unfortunate love affair of Polyphemus and the coquettish treatment he had received from Galatea, the fairest of the naiads; they had often heard repeated the melancholy complaints of the coy herdsman Menalaus, and they were familiar too with all the touching circumstances connected with the deplorable death of Daphnis, that prince of herdsmen. We make no mention of the destructive monsters said to have been always watching for ships outside of their island, the barking Scylla and fell Charybdis, the treacherous sirens with their seductive voices, and moreover beneath the island itself pressed down by the weight of Aetna, that awfully great, extended giant, Typhoeus with his hundred heads. These mythical beings entered not much into the mythology of the shepherds, and whenever thought of by them they caused them no great uneasiness, but, like the lashing billows along their coast, or the deceitful calm of the ocean abroad, or the sleeping terrors of Aetna underneath, they only threw around their comfortable island a terrific grandeur and imparted to their quiet homes an additional charm by way of happy contrast.

Dwelling amid such scenery with the spirit of antiquity thus looking out of it and giving to it, as does the soul to a beautiful countenance, new life and expression, how could the shepherds keep sometimes from feeling a little poetical? Watching their flocks and herds on those romantic

slopes, beneath the elms and oaks, in their idle hours how could they keep occasionally from weaving some of these legends into verse? and when they began to improve in vocal and instrumental music, how could they keep from becoming a little ambitious and vying with one another in song? No wonder too that in time some of them arrived at such proficiency and gained such skill in the art of singing and playing that, giving up the tending of herds and flocks, they made music their profession.

The way these shepherds first became connected with the worship of Artemis is variously accounted for. As pastorals in their style and composition are somewhat dramatic, one might suppose that their reciters or singers, would more likely have devoted themselves to the service of Dionysus, the great protector of players. With the wild orgies of this god, however, they had no sympathy. They preferred a milder worship. During the Persian invasion, according to one account, when the annual feast of Artemis came round at Sparta, all the virgin singers and dancers had hid themselves from fear of the enemy; whereupon some shepherds, coming into the temple, supplied their places in the celebration by singing some of their native songs. This new entertainment fell in so well with the entire spirit of her festival that it was ever afterwards retained. Some, however, place the introduction of these songs into her worship much earlier. They say that when Orestes carried off from Tauris the image of Artemis and brought it into Italy, that, to expiate his crime, he was required by the oracle to lave himself seven times in as many streams, all issuing from a single fountain. At Rhegium, having found the proper rivulets, he bathed as required, after which he passed over into Tyndaris in Sicily, where the shepherds, gathering around the sacred image, celebrated the goddess with their choicest songs. With this appropriate reception was she so well pleased that ever afterwards she became their protecting deity and always had some of them to take a part in her festivals.

At Tyndaris and Syracuse, whenever her feasts came

round, some shepherds or herdsmen, either two of them or two parties of them, enlivened the ceremonies by their musical contests with one another, and these, making this their vocation, came to constitute at last a class of performers well known throughout the whole country under the names of the *Lydiastæ* and *Bucolistæ*. On their way to these cities to join in the festivals, somewhat odd and ludicrous, we confess, must have been the appearances they presented, more resembling those of satyrs or clowns than of good and honest shepherds or herdsmen. Their crooks were all right enough and also their leathern srips with pulse in them, which they carried, but besides these they wore crowns and branching antlers, and slung around their shoulders somehow, they had each a wheaten loaf imprinted with figures of animals and a goatskin filled with wine. The vanquished gave up all these to the victors who remained in the cities. As for themselves, deprived thus of their wine and bread and pulse, they strolled abroad afterwards through the neighboring towns and rural districts, recruiting themselves and receiving from the people before whom they sang and played, rewards and sustenance, like wandering minstrels. To conciliate favor, whomever they approached they saluted with a benediction not wholly unlike the *Pax vobiscum* of Christian monks :

Receive from us good fortune and good health receive,
Which bear we from the goddess, which she bade us give.

The most then that Theocritus had to do was, from the mouths of these strolling singers and from those of the shepherds of the country, to gather up these floating legends, these unwritten songs, and throw them into more respectable shapes. In performing this task, however, so well suited to his genius, he took great liberties with his collections and improved them very much. Dispensing with their rude Priapæan measures he raised them into more dignified hexameters, modified, it is true, somewhat, and brought down from their heroic stateliness a little to suit his humbler themes. Retaining of these legends their simplicity of sentiment and broad Doric dialect, he yet wove

them so happily into his epic verse and diction as to elevate their whole tone and character and make them assume, as forming a new and distinct species of verse, a very high position in classical literature.

Of pastoral poetry the heroes, as we have said, belonged not always to the present times, but some of them had lived in the remotest ages. On this account the poet could throw around them all the halo of the past and place them almost on a par in this respect with the renowned warriors of the ancient Epos and tragedy. Daphnis, for instance, had flourished in those mythical times, beyond the ken of history, when there were lions in Sicily; and bears and wolves, and lynxes were far more common than they were in later days and better behaved. He was the beau ideal of a faithful herdsman, and to bring out his worth in full, of course, his constancy had to be tested. With him, in early life, a naiad fell in love and made him promise that he would never form a connexion with any other maiden, adding the threat that he would become blind if he ever violated his vow. Possessed of superior beauty and having besides great skill in music, being, in fact, the inventor of bucolic poetry, his society was much sought after, especially by young ladies, and few of them could look on him wholly unconcerned. Even Aphrodite or Cypris, queen of beauty, who always had, as we all know, a great *penchant* towards herdsmen and shepherds, was moved by his simple but winning address and fine accomplishments, and would have given him her love, but when the faithful swain treated her advances with coldness, her favor was turned into displeasure, and to cause his fall she incited against him also her son, that inconsiderate, winged boy who shoots at us so much at random, his tormenting arrows. Still Daphnis, setting at naught the frivolous bolt of Eros, would have come off unscathed in the end, had he not been overtaken by a stratagem. By a certain princess, whom, no doubt, Cypris had thrown into his way, he was made intoxicated, and while under the influence of wine he entirely forgot his vow, and, of course, was immediately

struck stone blind. Fleeing into the deepest shades he tried at first to console himself with music, but no longer visited now by his naiad, whom he still passionately loved, he gradually pined away and at last died. Before this sad conclusion of his woes he was visited by many gods and herdsmen and shepherds, some consoling and others bantering him. He heard them all, however, in silence, nursing alone his secret sorrow, until at length Cypria, the cause of all his griefs, arrived and was exulting over him. Then he could remain silent no longer, but, like a dying swan, uttered his last song. This was the song that the shepherd Thyrsis knew, and which, in the first Idyl of Theocritus, the Goatherd is very desirous to hear him repeat. To induce him to sing it he tells him he will give him in return for his song one of his best milch goats, whose good domestic properties he sets forth, and besides an ivy cup on whose wonderful carvings outside he descants at large. A sight of them, however, to keep up his curiosity, he withholds till afterwards.

THYRSIS AND THE GOATHERD.

THYRSIS.

Sweet, in a measure, goatherd, are the whisperings of that pine tree,
Which near the fountain blows, and sweetly breathe do you likewise
The shepherd's pipe. You, after Pan, the second prize would bear off.
The horned goat should he receive, the female goat would you take;
But his meed should the female be, to you would fall as guerdon
The kid, and of the kid sweet is the flesh till you have milked her.

GOATHERD.

Sweeter, O shepherd, is your singing than the mellow dashing
Which down from that high rock the water falling fast is making.
The ewe prefer, in case the muses should, to be their present,
Then would you take the weaned lamb, but should they rather
Receive the lamb, to you, of right, would fall the ewe thereafter.

THYRSIS.

Please, by the nymphs, O goatherd, will you in this place down seated,
Where gently slopes the hill and round the tamarisks are blooming,
To play for me your pipe? and I your goats meanwhile will look to.

GOATHERD.

Unlawful is it, shepherd, at full noon, for us unlawful
To play the pipe. We are afraid of Pan; for then from hunting

He wearied seeks repose, and, if disturbed the while, is peevish,
And ever round his disspread nose is waspish anger settled.
But come, Thyrsis,, for you surely know well the Griefs of Daphnia,
And you the highest art have reached to form bucolle verses,
This way ; beneath that elm let us be seated, to Priapus
And the spring nymphs right opposite, where standing is that rustic
Seat for such use, and oaks are round it. There, in case you sing me
Such strains as with the Lybian Cromus once you sang contending,
I will give you a goat, twin-bearing, twice that comes to milking,
Which, though she has two kids, will yield besides of milk two pailfuls,
And a deep cup of ivy wood inlaid with fragrant beeswax,
Two handled, newly formed, still smelling from the carver's chisel.
Of which the brim surrounding twines aloft the graceful ivy ;
Ivy all set between with marigolds, and it, among these,
Twisting its young twigs, hangs along profuse its yellow berries.
These underneath, a woman, workmanship of gods, is sculptured,
In flowing robes and fillet finely shewn ; and men beside her,
As exquisites, wearing long hair, in turn one with another
Contend in gibes ; but this her heart, oh cruel ! never touches.
One while to that man throws she smilingly soft glances,
Another while to this she's all attention. They still hanging
On her with eyes from passion swollen, uselessly are troubled.
Besides these an old fisherman, out in the sea, is sculptured,
Upon a rock, from which he through the waves drags quick his great net.
Old is he, but he toils as hard as were he in full vigor.
Of him in sooth it might be said, with all his might he fishes ;
So round his neck and shoulders every where the veins are swollen.
Old is he, to be sure, but for the nonce his strength is youthful.
Removed a little way from this gray-beard, sea-worn and wasted,
A vineyard is, with grapes all ready, ripened, heavy laden ;
Of which a certain little boy keeps watch, beside the thorn-hedge
Seated ; and by him are two foxes, one of which is walking
Between the rows and pulling down the dainty grapes, the other,
Slyly to take his wallet set, says to herself : This Argus
I will not leave, till in the lurch I leave him—with no dinner !
But he for locusts a nice cage of asphodels is weaving,
Binding them down with rushes ; and he thinks not of his wallet
Nor of the vines so much as he is pleased with his own plattling.
All round this cup below is carved the flexible acanthus.
A rare Aeolean work of art, when seen 'twill raise your wonder.
For it in honest trade gave I a Calydonian sailor
A milch goat and a monstrous cheese, the best of my own pressing.
Upon it I have not yet placed my lips, but it is laid up
Still undefiled. With right good will on you will I bestow it,
If you for me will friendly sing that song of yours I long for ;
And grudge you will I not. Come on, dear sir ; no use your verses
Unsung to keep for Hades' realm, where all things are forgotten.

THYRSIS—

Begin, ye muses bland, begin the plain bucolic verses.
 Thyrsis this is of Aetna and this is the voice of Thyrsis.
 Where were ye, O ye nymphs, when Daphnis wasted lorn, where were ye?
 Or on Peneus' banks in Tempe's vale, or on high Pindus?
 For held ye not the while near him the rapid stream, Anapus,
 Nor Aetna's summits of broad view nor Acis' sacred water.

Begin, ye muses bland, begin the plain bucolic verses.
 Wanting his song the lynxes mourned, his dirge the wolves were howling,
 And roared the lion, in deep shades, distraught that he had perished.

Begin, ye muses bland, begin the plain bucolic verses.
 Round him were gathered many kine and many saddened bullocks
 And calves and heifers many, sore oppressed, for him lorn lowing.

Begin, ye muses bland, begin the plain bucolic verses.
 Came Hermes from the mountain first and said: Now tell me, Daphnis,
 Who wears you thus away? Of whom are you so much enamored?

Begin, ye muses bland, begin the plain bucolic verses.
 Came next his fellow herdsmen, shepherds came, and lastly goatherds,
 All anxiously inquiring what was ailing. Came Priapus
 And said: Wretched Daphnis, what makes you pine away? That maiden,
 By every fount, through every grove, on eager feet is hurried—

Begin, ye muses bland, begin the plain bucolic verses—
 Seeking; but you, wayward in love, are heedlessly inconstant.

* * * * *

Them nothing answered did the herdsman, but endured, of his own
 Love the bitter pain, aye e'en to life's dark close endured it.

Begin, ye muses bland, begin the plain bucolic verses.
 Came Cypris to him also, pleased the while, why not? and smiling;—
 Bitterly smiling, but at heart she had a heavy sorrow,—
 And said: Daphnis, you boasted once that Eros you could conquer,
 But now it seems you are yourself by Eros sadly conquered.

Begin, ye muses bland, begin the plain bucolic verses.
 Thus taunted answered her the dying Daphnis: Cruel Cypris,
 Cypris to be dreaded, Cypris to mortals ever fatal!
 Thus, as you see, for us in sooth is now the last sun setting,
 But Daphnis, even in the Shades, shall be Love's bidding trouble.

Begin, ye muses bland, begin the plain bucolic verses.
 Steal, where they say with Cypris that a herdsman—Steal to Ida;
 Steal to your dear Anchises. There the oaks and there the rushes
 And there the lulling bees around their combs will suit you.

Begin, ye muses bland, begin the plain bucolic verses.
 Suit you too will Adonis, seeing sheep he also pastures
 And at the rabbits throws his crook and such like small game follows.
 Better brave Diomed again, this time more near advancing,
 And say: The herdsman Daphnis have I conquered, now come fight me

Begin, ye muses bland, begin the plain bucolic verses.
 Ye wolves, ye lynxes and ye bears in mountain dens that slumber,

Farewell ! Your herdsman I, Daphnis, no more will roam the wild woods,
No more the dusky groves nor thickets. Farewell, Arethusa,
And streams that roll your chrystal waters down into the Thymbris.

Begin, ye muses bland, begin the plain bucolic verses.
O Pan, Pan, whether on the mountain ranges of Lycaeus
You stay, or guard great Maenalus, come to this island.
Ev'n if beyond, from Rhion come, over your favorite mountain,
Called for Lycaon's son, unstayed, though to the gods delightful.

Give o'er, ye muses, go, give o'er the plain bucolic verses.
Come, O thou king and take from me this honey-breathing panspipe,
Of reeds compact with wax together, to the lip well rounded ;
Since really now by Love am I to Hades straightway borne off.

Give o'er, ye muses, go, give o'er the plain bucolic verses.
Now violets let brambles bear and bear them the acanthus,
The juniper bush deck itself with flowers of the narcissus ;
All interchanged let nature be, the pines with pears be laden,
Since Daphnis dies ; the deer in chase, the hounds, hard after seize on,
And in the mountains nightingales with owls together warble.

Give o'er, ye muses, go, give o'er the plain bucolic verses.
Thus having said he ceased, and to restore him Aphrodita
Ardently wished ; but by the Fates his threads had all been spun out,
And Daphnis went down to the dark river whose surges bore off
The man to all the muses dear and by the nymphs not hated.

Give o'er, ye muses, go, give o'er the plain bucolic verses.
Now fetch me forth that goat and cup that I may, having milked her,
Make libation to the muses. Oh, farewell, often, muses,
Farewell ; but I with you sweetlier will sing also hereafter.

GOATHERD.

With honey filled be that enchanting mouth of yours, O Thyrsis,
And with the honey-comb ; with figs from Aegilus be feasted,
The very best, since you than any tettix sing far better.
Here, take this treasured cup. Look at it, friend ; how fresh its odor !
Dipped would you think it had been in the fountains of the Horae.
Come hither, Nannie. Take her and milk her. Ye graceless young goats,
Give o'er your friskings or old Beardy there will come and—but you !

Even in the *Odyssey*, terrible as Polyphemus is represented to be, we are made to smile nevertheless at his credulity and artlessness. With all his simplicity of manners, however, we are utterly shocked at his want of humanity. His very tender mercies are cruel. For the good wine with which he had been treated by Ulysses he can think of making him no higher return than the promise that he will not eat him up immediately, but reserve him for his last meal, after he has used up all his compan-

ions as relishes at his suppers. For such a cold blooded monster we can be made to feel no sympathy even in his sufferings, and we rejoice at last when his eye has been thrust out with a stake, as his prisoners are thus enabled to escape. The Sicilian shepherds, however, regarded him with kindlier feelings. Though he was the son of Poseidon and a sea nymph, yet somehow he belonged also to the stock of the Cyclopes, the most ancient people of the island. They therefore, respected him as being not merely a native but an aboriginal. Laying hold, in his character, of all that was redeeming, they made the best use of it they could. They went back in their tales to his earlier days, when he was yet a shepherd boy in the mountains, of colossal proportions, it is true, but of a gentle nature, ere he had met with his heavy disappointments in life, which turned him into a recluse and an anthropophagite. Possessed he was of a voice, deep and rich, at any rate when heard in the distance, and he could play charmingly on the panspipe. Therefore, let Homer say what he will, and whatever he became afterwards, when a young Cyclops, he was certainly susceptible of the most tender impressions. His first and only love was Galatea, the fairest of the naiads. He met her for the first time when, a little girl, she came up out of the ocean with his mother to gather hyacinths on the mountain side. From that time forward he could never forget her, but, of course, his affection was unrequited. This disproportioned love affair was the theme of many a jocose and many a sentimental song among the shepherds. Down till the time of Theocritus and long afterwards he was their standing butt and great pet monster, who, they half believed, might possibly still be staying somewhere in the woody region of mount Aetna. In the charming summer nights of Sicily, when all the world there was then out of doors, as it is at such times even now, the merry girls abroad in bands together were in the habit of calling far up to him on the mountain, and if, in return, a rustling sound came sweeping down to them through the leaves, they startled half alarmed, and,

looking at one another, giggled outright as if they had really heard him coming. On a bright summer's day too, near the shore, one lad would sometimes seat himself upon a rock, trying to imitate Polyphemus, by looking big, playing on his panspipe and seeming to be as wholly absorbed as he possibly could in his music, while another would try to rouse him up by calling on him to observe the freaks of Galatea whom he let on he saw sporting in the water.

DAMOETAS AND DAPHNIS.

Damoetas and the herdsman, Daphnis, once into the same place
Their herds together drove, Aratus; one of them was downy
Chinned, the other tender-bearded. There seated by a fountain,
At mid-day, in the summer time, together thus they chanted.
And first began Daphnis, because he first had thrown the challenge.

DAPHNIS.

See, Polyphemus, how she pelts your flock, that Galatea,
With apples, calling you a goatherd and in love a laggard!
Whilst you, O dolt! O dolt! sit careless all absorbed in piping,
Never once looking at her. There, your faithful bitch that follows
After your sheep she hit, and off she starts a barking,
And looks into the deep; but her the waters scarcely ruffled,
Shew but herself as on the verge with ears up prickt she prances.
Take care! the ugly cur! she'll surely seize the maiden's ankle,
Should she step out upon the beach, and deeply wound her fair skin.
What winning gestures she assumes to lure you! As of thistles
The airy down, parched into lightness, borne abroad in genial summer,
Will flee if you pursue, but, turn away, it fondly follows.
No trick she leaves untried. Ah, let me tell you, Polyphemus,
Love's eyes are false, and things not fair to her may seem the fairest.

Damoetas then, as Cyclops, thus with deepened voice slow answered.

DAMOETAS.

I knew it all the while, by Pan, that she my sheep was pelting.
She could not escape me; by this sweet, lone eye of mine, she could not,
With which I still do see, though Telemus, that evil prophet,
Foretold its loss. The loss redound on him and on his children!
I knew it, but to vex her, all the while I took no notice;
To make her think I had another sweetheart, which she thinking
Grows jealous of me, O Paeon! and pine and in the ocean
Flings herself thus and peers amid my sheep and round my cavern.
My dog! I winked to her to bark at her, for when I fondle
With her she whines, and on my lap her about she fondly places;
Which favor shewn her she envying at length o'ercome will send me

A herald; but on him slammed he my door till she forth coming
 Swears that herself will make my bridal couch upon this island.
 As folks all say, I really bear a very fine appearance,
 This struck me once, gazing into the sea when in a calm state.
 Fine looking cheeks decidedly I saw, my eye fine looking,
 If I know anything of beauty, and the milky whiteness,
 Methought, of my teeth fairer shone than that of Parian marble.
 To keep these fresh from envy thrice I spat into my bosom.

This charm, to use a crone, a priestless of Cotyto taught me,
 For harverstars who played the flute, along the Hippoco-on.

Such answer having feigned Damoetas kissed his fellow Daphnis,
 Who gave a flute to him, who gave in turn to him a panspipe.
 Damoetas wakes his flute and with him pipes the herdsman Daphnis,
 And thereupon along the meads the calves all set to dancing.
 Neither of them the other conquered. Both remained unrivalled.

Such singing as this, however, is nothing better than
 boy's play. Addressing himself to his friend and fellow
 poet, the physician Nicias, Theocritus rises into a higher
 sphere. He shews us Polyphemus in a more interesting
 attitude uttering sentiments of the purest affection in such
 an unsophisticated strain that we become touched at once
 with his artlessness and simplicity. Fully aware now of
 his own want of personal charms he yet fancies that his
 mistress may possibly be pleased with him on account of
 his large possessions, his well supplied dairy and great
 number of sheep.

THE CYCLOPS.

A balm to heal the wound of love is nowhere to be met with
 In art or nature, Nicias, in simples or in compounds,
 But in the muses. Theirs the power that's gentle and subduing
 And to be had by men, but few, the gifted, that attain it.
 Which fact full well you know, I think, for being a physician,
 You by the sacred Nine besides are dearly loved and favored.

Thus eas'liest, at any rate, came off our native Cyclops,
 The olden Polyphemus, when inflamed of Galatea;
 What time his beard began to sprout about his mouth and temples.
 He wooed her, not with roses, not with apples, not with ringlets,
 But with wild plaints, and fixed on her, all other things neglected.
 His silly sheep back to their folds oft trooped themselves untended
 From their green pastures, whilst himself, singing of Galatea,
 Still kept the weedy sea-shore, where lone wandering he had wasted
 From morning red, beneath his breast pained by the sad infliction
 From mighty Cypria, in his heart deep planted, like an arrow.
 But still he found the sovereign balm, while, seated on a high rock,
 With longing looks all seaward cast, he sang away in this wise:

O my white Galatea, why your lover have you cast off?
Whiter than cream-cheese to behold, more gentle than a lambs-kin,
Than calf more frisky, smoother than of unripe grapes the clusters!
As such you ever come to me what times sweet slumbers hold me;
As such you ever fleet away what times sweet slumbers leave me.
You flee me as a sheep that sees the grayish wolf approaching.
I was enamored of you, maiden, even from the first time
You came up to the mountain-side along with my own mother,
To gather hyacinths; the way to show I went before you.
From gazing on you then and ever after till this present
I could not keep; but you care nothing for me, no, just nothing.
I know the reason, charming maiden, why you always shun me.
You do not like my shaggy eyebrow over all my forehead
Reaching from ear to ear across, a single but a long one,
And my lone eye beneath, and, o'er my lip, my nose that's flatted.
Such as I am, however, still of sheep I own a thousand;
From which the foaming milk I press and drink of it the choicest.
Fresh cheeses never fail me, not in summer, not in fruit time,
Not e'en in latest winter. Overburthened are my baskets.
And I can breathe the pipe and sing as knows not any Cyclops;
Singing of you, my own sweet apple, and myself together
All through the stormy nights. I'm keeping for you fawns eleven
All wearing splendid collars, and four tender bear cubs.
But come out once to us, just come, and you will be no loser.
Let the dark billows lift you up and bear you to the sea-shore.
When in our cave you'll find it sweeter there to spend the evenings.
There ever blooms the laurel, there the slender branching cypress;
There the dark ivy climbs and there the vine of sweetest clusters;
Whose juice to pale cold water drips, with which the woody Aetna,
From her pure snows that gleam above, ambrosial drink, supplies me.
Instead of such things who would choose to hold the sea or billows?
But if to you I seem myself to be too rough and hairy,
Oak splinters are at hand and living coals beneath the ashes
With which to singe me. Ev'n my soul to you I would surrender
And my lone eye to burn, than which not any thing is dearer.
Ah me! my mother did not bear me having gills of fishes,
Else would I dive me down and kiss, at any rate, your fingers,
If mouth you would not wish. Along I'd take you or white lilies
Or tender poppy heads having the red explosive petals.
But these, the first in summer bloom, the others in late winter.
So both of them to you at once I could not take together.
Forthwith now, maiden, will I now be taught to be a swimmer
By some kind sailor in a ship that hither comes a sailing;
And I will taste your life if sweet far down within the sea-depths.
Will you come up, my Galatea, and when up, oh never!
As do not I while seated here, think more of going homeward!
But keep with us the flocks together and express the rich milk;
And make the curds for cheeses come by putting in the runnet.

My mother wrongs me, she alone, and her the most I censure;
For never drops she any word to you that's kind and tender
Concerning me, though every day she sees me growing thinner.
I'll tell her, yes, I'll tell her of my head and feet sore throbbing,
That she for my sake too may grieve as I am deeply grieving.
O Cyclops, Cyclops, whither thus are wandering thy poor senses!
Go, plait your baskets in your cave and, cutting off the young shoots,
Supply your lambs. Thus will you soon at heart be feeling better.
The present sheep prefer to milk, the one that flees why follow?
Perhaps you'll find another Galatea and a lovelier;
For many merry girls at night to come and sport call to me,
Far down the glens, and giggle all whene'er they know I'm listening.
On land, at any rate, ev'n I seem to be counted some one.
Thus Polyphemus soothed his love by chanting his wild verses.
And came off better in the end than had he—paid the doctor.

In publishing thus a few of these idyls we have been actuated partly by the same motive which induced Theocritus to write them at first. We wish to make our readers, whether for their pleasure or profit, a little better acquainted, as he does his, with the life and manners of the old Sicilian shepherds. We wish moreover to draw, to the finely executed pictures themselves of this rare old artist, the attention of amateurs and scholars, as of late years, we think, they have been altogether too much thrust aside and neglected. Though exceedingly simple in their style and composition these poems are yet master-pieces of art in their kind, being truer delineations of nature than any pastorals that have ever since been written. Like the best paintings in oils of later years, they have been nothing injured by the lapse of time, but rather mellowed and improved. What we have given above, of course, are not any of the pictures themselves. They are merely some copies or transcripts from the original; and though we have tried, in rendering them into English, to be as literal as possible, giving them, for the most part, word for word and certainly always line for line, yet a great deal of their spirit, we feel conscious, has escaped in the transfer. They cannot be brought over fully into another language. To catch all their simple pathos and quaint humor and rich expression they must be read only in their broad Doric.

W. M. N.

ART. VI.—THE EUTYCHIAN CHURCHES.*

THE apostles of Christ, in obedience to the command of their Master, preached to all the world repentance toward God and faith in Jesus Christ, and those, that believed their word, were received into the Christian Church by baptism. This faith was an authoritative faith (*Πιστις*), i. e., the preached word was received by the hearers on the authority of the apostles, no matter whether their whole deportment made them appear as credible, unexceptionable witnesses, or, these favorable impressions were produced by signs and wonders, wrought by them. But this faith did not necessarily include the whole scheme of Christian salvation; where it did, it was only in embryo, and required time for development. The Christian mind rests but for a time satisfied with an authoritative faith, and then longs to understand, digest and develop into full consciousness the object of faith—the principium essendi,—the authoritative faith embodying the first germs of *γνωσις* (knowledge). This anthropological view we find fully sustained and corroborated by the history of the Church. It was but for a short time that the Church was satisfied with a belief in Christ as the Messiah; His relation both to God and man was soon made the subject of earnest investigation; and by blending with exclusively Christian elements ethnical and Jewish ideas, a *γνωσις*, sometimes friendly, oftener hostile to Christianity, but in every instance truth mixed with error, was the result. Of this kind were the Ebionites, who saw in Christ a mere man, however highly gifted in other respects; Jesus was to them, what Mohammed is to his followers. At his baptism a higher aeon descended upon him, taught and wrought miracles through him, but left the man Jesus on the cross. Cerinthus, who headed this party of Ebionites,

* Compiled mainly from the German of Hoffman.

formed the transition to the real Gnostics, who, for the most part, inverted the case and denied the humanity of Christ; this system culminated in Manicheism. The so-called Catholic Church developed her faith, formally at least, in the same manner. After different views of Christ had been broached and rejected, Arius arose, who made Christ a creature. His numerous disciples did not dream, by following him, of departing from their former faith. Still larger was the party of the Semiarrians; and without the overwhelming superiority of Athanasius, it is but too probable, humanly speaking, that Semiarianism would have triumphed at Nice. Truth, however, prevailed; partly by its intrinsic force, partly by means that we deplore, it became the universally received opinion of the Church.

Christ's divinity having been authoritatively settled, the relation of His two natures claimed the attention of the Church. Here Nestorius acquired an unenviable reputation by teaching that each nature became a personality, so that he had, instead of one, two Christs or Saviours, and if two, of course none at all. For if the two natures in Christ are not so united, that Christ's personality, or I, includes them both and fully—*απεπρως, ασυγχυτως* and *αδιαπερως*—as the Synod of Chalcedon has decreed—then God and man are not really united, the deep desire of the human heart is not yet satisfied, and we are not yet saved. Nestorianism was accordingly rejected by the Church, but many opponents of Nestorius, not by pushing their opposition to him too far, as is generally believed, but by starting from the same fundamental error and developing it in a different shape, arrived at an opposite but equally fundamental error. They assumed, as Nestorius did, two concretes in Christ, a divine Christ and a human Christ, but in order to bring about a unio personalis, they curtailed both His divine and His human nature, making Him more than a man, but less than God, a kind of demi-God. This is Eutychianism. Both these views are rejected by the Church as heretical; but there are good reasons for believing, that these errors

are still in vogue, that Nestorianism is really the faith of the many, as appears from the facility with which they expound certain texts of Scripture by saying, that such a clause or such an act belongs to Christ as God, and such a one to Him as a man; but it appears still more from the fact, that Eutychianism and Nestorianism are regarded as opposite extremes, whereas they involve the same fundamental error, in consequence of which controversialists charge each other with these heresies, as if it were a matter of course, that the truth must lie between the two extremes. In order to prove this statement, we shall advert to but one fact: the passage, John 8: 58, is explained by all the English commentators with whom I am acquainted, if any notice is taken of it at all, as if Christ had said: before Abraham was, *I was*, and a French translation, which I have at hand, actually translates it so: *j'etais*. From these desultory remark, it is also evident how far those miss the mark, who maintain that a study of christology, or soteriology is of no account; that men ought to become converted and that correct views of these subjects would follow as a matter of course!! Yet our object is not to write a metaphysical essay on the God-man, but to give a condensed history of the Eutychian Churches, and as these Churches have, in consequence of their separation from the orthodox Church, undergone but slight changes, a description of them is, at the same time, a description of the whole Church in the fifth century. The Eutychian Churches are: the *Egyptian or Coptic*, the *Arminian*, the *Ethiopian*, and the *Abyssinian*.

THE EGYPTIAN CHURCH.

It is not exactly known by whom Christianity was planted in Egypt. According to Acts 2: 10; 6: 9; 18: 24, it would seem that seeds of the Christian religion were sowed there in the very earliest times. Eusebius of Caesarea, (History 2, 16) says, that Mark, the fellow-traveller of Peter, went to Egypt after Peter's death, and became the first bishop of Alexandria. Here arose the great catechists, Pantænus, Clemens, Origenes and Heraeles; and the still greater

Athanasius was also an Egyptian. When the doctrine of Eutyches was condemned and persecuted as heresy, the great body of the people espoused Monophysitism (but another name for Eutychianism) (2,000,000), while only a small minority of 200,000 held the faith of the orthodox Church. They called themselves also the Coptic Church, not from the town *Κοπτος*, as has been erroneously supposed, but from *Αγυπτος-Γυπτος*, and called the orthodox party Melchites—from meloch, king, likewise, the emperor's Christians. The two parties had after this time two patriarchs. They hated each other with a rather unchristian hatred, and murdered each other on every occasion; yea the Copts assisted the Mohammedans greatly in subjugating their own country. At first they were mildly treated and had to pay but a moderate tribute; but ere long they were sorely persecuted, and although Egypt has changed its rulers a number of times, yet the Christians have always suffered, and it may justly be said, that they have atoned by their sufferings during 1200 years for their sins. At present their number is but 200,000, 60,000 of whom live in Cairo, the rest in Upper Egypt in villages, partly alone, partly together with the Arabian Fellahs (peasants). The patriarch of Alexandria, who, however, resides in Cario, has been at their head from the times of the Arabs. His jurisdiction extends beyond Egypt as far as Nubia and Abyssinia, from which country he elects and consecrates the patriarch (Abuna). He himself is chosen from the monks, the bishops and arch priests applying, when the seat is vacant, to the abbot of St. Anthony's convent who proposes six or eight monks, and from this number the patriarch is selected by lot. A detachment of soldiers is ordered to conduct him to his new residence, since it has become customary to feign resistance and yield only to force. Next to him in dignity is the patriarch of Jerusalem, who resides likewise at Cario, and visits the holy land but once a year, about Easter, and is the official vicar of the patriarch of Egypt. Under him are twelve real or titular bishops, and under these again the arch priests

and priests, whose duty it is to say mass, but not to preach; *as preaching is something altogether unknown in the Coptic Church.* Then follow the archdeacons, deacons and subdeacons, lectors, cantors and exorcists. The ordination is performed by the patriarch and his bishops with the sacred oil, which, by a miracle of St. Mark, never fails. An apostolical succession, *by the imposition of hands*, is entirely unknown.

The priests belong to the lower ranks of society and are ignorant, rude and poor; they live by agriculture and on their perquisites from weddings, burials and baptizing, and by begging. The monks read the liturgy. As to their creed, they recognize the three oecumenical synods of Nice, Constantinople and Ephesus, and three liturgies, viz: that of St. Basil, Gregory and Cyril, and the Apostolical Constitutions. The liturgy is read in Coptic, although the common people do not understand the Coptic language. They have seven sacraments, like the Church of Rome; but extreme unction is also applied to healthy persons after great offenses.

The deplorable state of the Coptic Church induced (1825) the Church Missionary Society to permit two missionaries, Sieder and Cruse, to locate at Cario in order to revive Christianity. They succeeded, after hard labor, in bringing the Bible to the knowledge of the priests, in instructing a few hundred Coptic children in the principles of Christianity, and in establishing a Seminary for priests, from which the present Abuna of the Abyssinian Church has been taken. The patriarch favors their labors. It is true, no evangelical reformation has taken place yet, but the way is fully prepared. If the priests, who are at the same time the lower officers in the villages, should become active and zealous Christians, their influence on the fellahs would be immense.

The Bible is translated into three dialects, viz: the Coptic or Memphitic, the Sahidic or Upper Egyptian and the Basmur—translations which were made in the fourth or fifth centuries.

THE ETHIOPIAN CHURCH.

What used to be called the Ethiopian Church, has undergone so great changes, that it will hardly do to describe it by itself. What we shall say on this subject will apply to the ancient Ethiopian Church, whilst the description of the present Ethiopioian Church will be given in connection with the Abyssinian Church. In Acts 8: 27, a man of Ethiopia, a eunuch of great authority under Candace, queen of the Ethiopians, is mentioned, who became converted under the preaching of Philip; it is likely, indeed, that this high officer preached to his countrymen Christ crucified after his return, *but there are no satisfactory proofs, that a Church was founded by him.* For the ancient Church knew of no Christian Church in Ethiopia proper, and Jerome (catal. script. eccl.) is of opinion, that Arabia Felix was the home of said eunuch. There is indeed a tradition, that makes not less than three of the apostles, Thomas, Andrew, and Matthew, apostles of Ethiopia, but this tradition itself understands different Asiatic countries, even India, by the term Ethiopia, and sound criticism has shorn the whole story of all credibility. The first *reliable* account is, that under Constantine the Great (about 330 B. C.) the heathen philosopher, Metrodorus, returned from extensive exploring tours in safety to Tyre, and prevailed on Meropius, whom some called a philosopher, others a merchant, to engage in a similar enterprize (see Rufini hist. eccl. I, 5, 9; Theod. hist. eccl. I, 22; Socrates hist. eccl. I, 19; Sozomeni hist. eccl. II, 24). He set out in company with his nephews, Frumentius and Aedesius, and suffered shipwreck on the coasts of Ethiopia—called by the ancients India;—the crew was murdered by the barbarous inhabitants, but the young men were spared and sold as slaves to the king of Axume (now Axum in Tigré); the one became the king's treasurer, the other his butler. The king granted them their liberty before his death. The queen, who reigned in the place of her son Aizan, continued the two Christians in their high offices; and they in turn used their great influence in introducing Christianity into the country. They attracted

Egyptian merchants, and the Christians obtained the right to settle, with many other privileges. Under Aizan Aede-sius returned to Tyre; Frumentius went to Alexandria, where Athanasius was patriarch, applied to him for priests for his new home, got them, was himself ordained as bishop, and was now called Abba Salama. The king and his brother were baptized, and Christianity spread rapidly. But the Arian convulsions reached as far as the Alps of Central Africa. The Arians endeavored, but did not succeed, in introducing their tenets into Ethiopia.

Another account of the introduction of the Christian religion into Ethiopia, as given by Cachenus, Nicephorus and Procopius, has been rejected by Ludolf. After Frumentius, the patriarch, or Abuna of Abyssinia, the most important branch of the Ethiopian Church, was consecrated by the patriarch of Alexandria; he had the rank but not the power of a patriarch, and could at no time have more than seven bishops under his jurisdiction. The Bible is indeed translated into Ethiopic, but the laity do not read it at all, and the priests, who read it, do not understand it. Of equal authority with the Bible are the Apostolical Constitutions and Canons in eight parts, for which reason the New Testament is sometimes said to contain thirty-five books. Then follow (in degree of authority) the decrees of the Synods of Nice, Constantinople and Ephesus; to the twenty genuine Canons of the Council of Nice eighty-four spurious ones are added, and these and extracts from the homilies of Athanasius, Basilus, the two Gregories, Chrysostom and Cyrillus, together with some martyrologies and hymns, constitute the literature of the Ethiopian Church.

When the Synod of Chalcedon condemned the patriarch Dioscor of Alexandria as an Eutychian, which gave rise to the sect of the Monophysites, the Ethiopian Church followed her patriarch, calling the orthodox the Melchites, while they in turn, were called Jacobites, from the Syrian Jacob Baradai. But they have always affirmed, that they did not deny the two natures of Christ, their only object

having been to avoid the danger of Nestorianism. For this reason, the Coptic patriarch of Alexandria used to consecrate the bishop or Abuna of Ethiopia. Other reports say, that there was still a probability that the Ethiopian Church would unite again with the catholic Church, until the Mohammedans reduced Egypt in the seventh century, when for about eighty years there was no Melchitic, i. e., catholic bishop of Alexandria, but only a Coptic. Thus the separation, which had taken place before, was confirmed.

How far the missionary operations of the Ethiopian Church extended, is not exactly known. They introduced Christianity into Meroë, on the North, but when this was done can not be ascertained. The Nubian historian, Selim el Assuany, in the tenth century, says, that the inhabitants of the island of Aloa (Meroë, Shendy) were Jacobites, who got their bishops from Alexandria, and had translated the Bible into their own from the Greek language. Elmacin also speaks of all Nubia as a Jacobitic-Christian country in the fourteenth century. As late as the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries the Mohammedans were only tolerated here; but in the sixteenth century the coasts were conquered by the Turks from Arabia, who soon made themselves masters of the whole country. Christianity disappeared now, and Abyssinia was isolated from both Egypt and the rest of the Christian world. Toward the West the Christian religion seems not to have spread; the Funga negroes remained pagans. But along the Eastern coasts Christianity flourished, and in the South was the bishopric of Adule. The influence of the Ethiopian Church extended as far as Koffa and Narea, perhaps even as far as central Africa; for up to this very day the Ethiopians speak of Christians, that live at a great distance in central Africa.

There is an Ethiopian translation of the Bible extant—the old vernacular language of the Axumitic empire, called by the natives the Geez-language,—which is still the only authorized version in use, although the Ethiopic language has long ago ceased to be spoken by the people. When and

by whom this translation was made, is not known. It is true, the Abyssinians say, that it was made by their first bishop, Frumentius, or by the nine saints, who labored in the fifth century in Abyssinia, from the Arabic; but this tradition is evidently false, since it presupposes an Arabian translation of the Bible before the times of Mohammed. On the contrary, there is conclusive internal evidence that the Ethiopian translation was made from the Greek in the fourth or fifth century. On comparing the two we find an agreement of numberless passages of the Ethiopian version with the Greek text as used by the Church of Alexandria in the fourth century, which contradicts the opinion that the translation was made from any other source. This enables us at the same time to determine the time when this translation was made. For it was only in the first period of Ethiopian literature, that translations were made from the Greek; after the Arabic became the language of Egypt, Ethiopian literature came under the same influence. There are still other reasons for this opinion. Christianity can exist in no country for any length of time without a translation of the Bible into the language of that country, for which reason it has always been one of the first objects of missionaries to translate the Bible into the language of the country which they had converted or wished to convert to Christianity. But we find that in the fifth century Christianity was firmly established in Abyssinia; in the sixth century the great poet and musician, Jared, created the Abyssinian Church-music, and this he could not have done without books. Yea, even Chrysostom seems to have been acquainted with an Ethiopian translation of the Bible. By whom it was made, can not be determined now, nor is it of any importance; but there is internal evidence that it was not made by one person, nor at the same time. It is on the whole good, following the Greek almost slavishly; yet so many additions and alterations have been made in the course of time, that some books, especially the four Gospels, resemble paraphrases rather than translations. In 1830 Th. P.

Platt published the New Testament, assisted by the British and Foreign Bible Society; this edition is better than that of Rome, but still full of errors. A critical edition of the whole Old Testament by A. Dillman is now in press.

THE ABYSSINIAN CHURCH.

The once powerful kingdom of Abyssinia, situated between the sixteenth and eighth degree of north latitude and the thirty-fifth and forty-third of east longitude (from Greenwich) and bounded on the east by the Red Sea, on the north by Sennaar, west and south by Sennaar, Kordofan and barbarous regions, was but lately a prey to anarchy and completely dismembered. Among the various kingdoms into which it was divided, the following were the principal: 1) the northeastern highland, called Tigré; 2) the southeastern highland, Amhara and Shoa, sometimes called Gondar, from the ancient capital; 3) the surrounding low-lands.

The Abyssinian Church is monophysitic and is under the jurisdiction of the Coptic patriarch of Alexandria; many traits of her character are the result of local and other causes. Legendary tales are still repeated by the Abyssinian priests, to the effect that the Abyssinian nation was converted to Judaism by its kings, who descended from Solomon; but the many relics of Judaism, as circumcision before baptism, the arrangement of their Churches, &c., can be accounted for from the fact that the Jews were formerly very numerous in the country, without giving credit to this legend of a conversion of the whole nation to the Jewish religion. But the priests speak also of the nation's conversion to Christianity by Frumentius. "We drink of the well of the patriarch of Alexandria," is one of their favorite sayings, in order to defend their ecclesiastical position. The Symbolum of the Apostles is not known to them. They use the Nicene form of baptism. The Bible, which, however, is only found in convents and among very rich people, is highly esteemed by the priests, but exists invariably in the Ethiopian translation, although the new

Amharic version would be far more intelligible to them. Their exegesis is very romantic and allegorical. One of their commentators, e. g., understands by the foxes, (Matth. 8: 20) kings and governors, but by the birds, bishops and priests, because they rise in their prayers up to God; and by the eye, (Matth. 5: 29) the wife, or child, by the hand, the servant.

Monophysites, by profession, the question concerning the two natures of Christ is settled, Christ having, in their opinion, only one nature, viz: the divine, the human nature being unnecessary to constitute His mediatorial Person. But they are engaged in angry debates about the births of Christ. For the last sixty years the different parties have been engaged in deadly conflict about this question, and the different kingdoms into which the country is divided, have made it a political question. The anointing of Christ with the Holy Ghost is the starting-point of difference. The Abyssinian, who looks upon the humanity of Christ as of but secondary moment, attaching all importance to His divine nature, must logically conclude that the human nature needs no unction of the Holy Ghost. For this reason they refer every thing that is said in the New Testament of the Holy Ghost as communicated to Christ, to His incarnation or birth. The Spirit of God, given to Christ, would accordingly be His divinity. This doctrine, which is consistent with the monophysitic principle, is also thus expressed: Christ anointed Himself. This doctrine is so much insisted upon in Tigré, that an ecclesiastic, who holds a different view, is at once deposed from office. Opposed to this is the doctrine of the three births, one of which is the eternal generation of the Son by the Father, the second, His conception and birth, and the third, His being anointed with the Holy Ghost in the womb of His mother. His unction of the Holy Ghost as belonging to His human nature is called a third birth, because by this His human nature was raised to a higher dignity. As the Abyssinians believe with the whole Greek Church, that the Holy Ghost

proceeds only from the Father, it is a matter of course, that this last view is altogether incompatible with the notion of Christ's anointing Himself. The Holy Ghost is considered as being distinct from the divinity of Christ and as a gift of the Father to the Son. This view is, indeed, less consistent than the former, but places the humanity of Christ in a more correct relation to His divine nature. This is the prevailing doctrine in Amhara and Shoa, and the present king proclaimed publicly by heralds, that whoever opposed this doctrine of the three births would subject himself to banishment and his property to confiscation. But this doctrine was opposed by the Abuna of Gondor, who advocated the opposite view prevailing in Tigré. A new controversy has grown out of this, since the eunuch Aroe of Gondor taught, in order to support the third birth of Christ, that the human soul possessed self-consciousness already in the womb, and a knowledge of good and evil, even fasted and prayed there already. The most influential priests, the Etshege or general of the monks of Debra Libanos and his abbot (Alaca) favored this doctrine; the king supported it and deposed many priests that opposed it. But the persecuted hurled anathemas against the victorious party, and a civil war was the consequence.

Another subject in dispute, was the question, whether Christ in Heaven adored the Father, or whether He is co-ordinate and rules the world jointly with Him. The king and the ruling party taught that Christ praises the Father. In the last place, they disputed about Mary, whether she ought to be called "mother of God," (*Waladita Amlak*) or only mother of Jesus, and whether she is entitled to the same worship as the Son. The party in Ankobar and Debra Libanos maintains, that the Son alone ought to be adored, (*wa lawold magast*), while their opponents in Fatygar are called *Masle Wold* (like the Son). These were the controversies concerning the doctrine of the three births; but the political aspect of the country having changed, the victorious party has crushed the belief in the three births.

Another opinion is, that the Holy Ghost was only the mediator between the divine and human natures of Christ. According to Abba Gregory (*theologia aethiopica* in *Fabricii salutaris lux evangelii*) the peculiar phraseology: "the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and takes from the Son," (John 14: 15) is current in Abyssinia.—They believe in a kind of purgatory. Persons that are excommunicated for great offences, and die in this state, go into sheol, and remain there until they are delivered by fasts and prayers, but especially by masses said in their behalf. Michael, the archangel, is called upon as the conductor of souls from sheol into heaven. A kind of chiliasm prevails, and a certain Theodotus is expected to establish at the end of days a kingdom of perfect children.

Children of both sexes are circumcised between the third and the eighth day after birth, and then follows baptism, not always immediately, but in every case before the tenth day after birth. The rite consists in prayers, exorcism, immersion, benediction, turning of the individual baptized to the four quarters of the heavens, imposition of hands, and anointing with the holy oil. Sponsors are necessary. Adults are baptized by having water poured over them. Hymns are sung in honor of the Virgin Mary, the Nicene Creed, the Lord's Prayer and third chapter of John are read; the water in the basin is consecrated with incense, and the pronunciation of the following words: "Praised be the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost;" an iron cross is drawn three times through the water, with the words: "A holy Father, a holy Son, and a Holy Ghost." Cotton cords are dipped in the sacred oil and therewith the sign of the cross is made on the forehead of the person baptized, and one of the cords is hung around his neck; then the communion follows. The Abyssinian Christian carries a blue silk cord through life around his neck in remembrance of his baptism and as a mark of distinction from Jews and Mohammedans. Jews and Mohammedans that wish to be baptized, commit the Nicene Creed and a

few legends to memory. If they are rich, they build a church, if not, they make the priest a present of some grain. Thus many Gallas have been converted. The ceremony of Baptism is performed outside of the church; the Lord's Supper is administered inside of the church. For the communion unleavened bread, and wine, are used; the priests commune daily, the laity as often as they please. Adults only go to confession before communion, as children and persons under twenty-five years of age are supposed to be guiltless. Infant communion is universal; private communion is unknown. In the same church mass can be said but once a day. The communicants are forbidden to spit before the sun sets. Every one, the priests not excepted, has his confessor, to whom he applies, whenever his conscience accuses him. Children, that are twelve years old, stand in a white dress, which is presented to them, on communion days all day fasting in the church, without understanding the object of the ceremony; for they believe that it is intended to make them grow (physically).

The Abuna or patriarch, is chosen and consecrated by the Patriarch of Alexandria. He is chosen from the Copts, sometimes against his will, instructed and consecrated; and a detachment of soldiers conducts him to his residence, which is in Gondor, but his jurisdiction extends also over the Church in Shoa and Tigré. His salary, which consists in the produce of lands and ordination fees, is very considerable; at one time the third part of the produce of the province was destined for him. His power is limited only by that of the king, but sometimes becomes formidable to the king himself. He ordains by breathing upon the candidates and signing them with the sign of the cross. When in 1842 a new Abuna arrived, after the seat had been vacant for eleven years, he had to ordain one thousand persons a day, who arrived in caravans, from all the provinces, at Gondor. The qualifications for ordination are: the candidates must know how to read Ethiopic, to sing from the book Yared and have a beard, as no one can be ordained before his eighteenth year. The fee is about ten cents. In mat

ters of faith the Abuna is the highest authority, and is sometimes appealed to even in civil cases. Under him are the bishops, whose business, however, is no other than to keep the churches, their vessels, etc., clean and sacred. Next comes the Alaka, who administers the revenues of the church, and receives the presents; and finally the priest, who alone can enter the *sanctissimum*, which is shut even against the deacon. The deacon assists the priests in public worship, and bakes the bread for the Lord's Supper, keeps the church and the vessels clean.

The numerous monasteries of the two orders—that of the celebrated saint Tekla Haimanot and that of saint Eustathius—are under the Etshege of Debra Libanos in Shoa. The monks live as they used to do in Europe during the middle ages; they beg, loiter about, some celebrate public service, dispute about religious questions and say the rosary. They live in celibacy, A cap, a dirty cloth around the head, the skin of an animal, and a leathern girdle, mark the monks. The number of priests and monks in Shoa alone is said to exceed 12,000, whilst that in Gondor is still greater. The most celebrated convents are Debra Libanos in Shoa, St. Stephen on the Haik-lake in Jeschu, Debra Daino and Axum Thion in Tigré and Lalibela in Lasta. To a fully supplied church belong twenty priests and deacons, one third of whom attend to the public services, while the rest instruct some children—their spiritual sons—or live at home with their families. For the priests are allowed to marry, although but once. The churches, which are very numerous, are generally built on hills, shaded by beautiful trees, circular, low, thatched, adorned with a glittering brass crucifix; the walls are poorly built, whitewashed on the outside and furnished with four doors facing the four quarters of the heavens. Inside the building is full of dirt, the walls are covered with abominable pictures of Mary, of angels, devils, etc. Sculptures are forbidden. A vestibule surrounds the whole church, destined for the laity, for the daily morning prayers, and serving needy travelers as a lodging. The inside of the church is

divided into the sanctuary and the sanctissimum. The sanctuary is hung with relics and accessible to the priests and deacons alone. The communion is celebrated here, while the laity are behind a curtain. Women can not come even here. In the sanctissimum, behind a curtain, is the ark of the covenant, with a parchment on which the name of the tutelary saint of the church is written. Here only the Alaca and the priests enter. The ark is anointed with the sacred oil (Maron) and can not be touched even by the deacon; if this is done, the ark and the whole church must be consecrated anew. For on this ark the sacredness of the house and of the surrounding burial ground depends.

The public services consist of singing psalms, reading portions of Scripture and parts of martyrologies, the priests dancing all the while and beating violently with their canes. The prayers are principally addressed to Mary, the nine saints that established Christianity in the country, Frumentius, angels and other saints. Every beggar appeals to one of the many saints, in order to call forth sympathy, but Mary is honored above all the rest, and called even "the creatrix of the world." Combes and Tamisier (*Voyage in Abyss.*, IV., 159) give a list of one hundred and five saints from the Old and New Testaments, the Greek, Egyptian and Ethiopian Churches and legends. The most absurd stories are current among the people, e. g., that mineral springs were formed, savage beasts tamed, lions harnessed by the saints uttering but one word, that a roasted child was restored to life, that Mohammed, the prophet, was present as a demoniac at the council of Nice, etc.

The Abyssinian Church keeps both the Jewish Sabbath and the Christian Sunday, calling the latter the great Sabbath, and has no less than one hundred and eighty festivals a year. The most prominent of these festive days are, beside those which the Church universally observes, the day of Epiphany, on the 18th of January, the three festivals of Tekla Haimanot in May, August and December, commemorative of his ascension, death and birth. On the festival

of Epiphany the priests march with all the arks of the town and neighborhood to a rivulet or river and the festival commences with singing and shouting; the poor receive presents. By the light of torches, at midnight, a priest descends into the water and blesses it, whereupon the whole crowd, old and young, parents and children, plunge into the river, in order to bathe, and an almost hellish noise and tumult follow. On one of the Tekla festivals thousands make pilgrimages to Debra Libanos in order to get some of the dust from the graves of the saints, which is supposed to prevent or cure diseases; or to drink the water of the mineral springs, which are to be found there.

Fasting is regarded the great means of salvation, and consequently is more rigidly observed than by any other Church. Every Wednesday and Friday, as well as every communion day, is a day of fasting, on which it is unlawful to eat anything but nettles and dry bread: add to these the Hodad or Kabala fast of forty days, the Kenoua fast in April of three days, the twelve to fifteen days' fast in June, the Niniae fast of three days in July, a fast of sixteen days in August, so that the pious Abyssinian has to keep about two hundred fasts a year. It is true, that many of them are not kept, and still many more would be violated, if burial in consecrated ground did not depend on the religious observance of these fast days.

Meritorious works are: alms to beggars, pilgrims, monks and priests, that are given by the donor "for his own works' sake," presents to churches and convents, especially the building of new or the repairing of old churches, pilgrimages to the sacred places in the land, to Debra Libanos, St. Stephen, Debra Damo; but whoever makes a pilgrimage to Jerusalem is a saint, and miraculous cures are expected to be performed by him. In this respect the Abyssinian Church is really Pagan, magic and the superstition about armlets being as much practiced by her members as by Pagans or Mohammedans. Superstition has almost extinguished Christian elements. The enactments of the Mosaic law concerning clean and unclean food are scrupu-

lously observed. The Abyssinian, moreover, abhors the use of coffee, fearing, that even by touching it, he would place himself on an equal footing with the Mohammedan.

Matrimonial relations are generally entered into without the intervention of the priests, and are, for this very reason, easily dissolved again, provided a man marries not more than four women in succession. Some marriages, however, can not be dissolved, having been sealed with the Eucharist. Marriage is annulled by the priest. Whoever has married or dismissed four women, is excommunicated, unless he becomes a monk. Marriage relations are dissolved also by the husband turning monk, without saying one word to the priest, his poor wife and children being left to care for themselves. Polygamy is, indeed, forbidden, but the kings and great ones have often three or four wives at the same time, and a number of concubines besides.

Shortly before death the priest is generally sent for in order to hear confession and impart absolution to the sick; and this he never fails to do, if his relatives promise to give a due proportion of alms and to do penance; a part of this penance being often done by the priest himself for pay. If the deceased be rich, feasts of penance are celebrated, that last for some time. Burials take place immediately after death with Jewish lamentations and funeral feasts in or near the church, the priests assisting. Portions of the Bible are read, and the crucifix heads the procession.

The many Jewish elements in the Abyssinian Church, as circumcision, the Sabbath, forbidden meals, fasts, lamentations at funerals, the ark of the covenant, division of the churches after the style of the Jewish Temple, and other customs, may easily be accounted for without giving credence to their own notion, that their kings are of Jewish extraction and that they were once Jews themselves. The character of the Church, to which Abyssinia owes its conversion, the influence of Egypt, the Arabian origin of the Abyssinian people, the near relation between Jews and Arabs as to customs and manners, the proximity of Jewish

Christians—the Homerites and Adulitanians—the influence of the Old Testament, which the priests pray and sing (the psalms), the four centuries of Jewish rule, the intermingling with Jews and Mohammedans, and man's propensity to outward legalism in matters of religion ;—all account fully for these Jewish elements.

The moral and religious character of the Abyssinians is lamentable. Indifference to the substance of religion—saving faith ; moral laxity and laziness are their principal traits. The ignorance of both priests and laymen, the bad example of the former who are rarely surpassed in lying, cunning and avarice, the many festivals that necessarily engender laziness ; the political confusion ; the mixture with Jews and Mohammedans ;—all these things exert a disastrous influence. But lewdness and lasciviousness are the inveterate vices of the nation. There are still remnants of gross idolatry visible. The sects are but insignificant ; the Jews are numerous, but much less so than formerly.

Pains have been taken for some time to raise the moral and religious standing of the Abyssinians. In 1808 the French consul at Alexandria, Monsieur Asselin, engaged the noble Abyssinian Abreka, the companion of Bruce, to translate the Ethiopian Old and New Testaments into Amharic, and this translation was executed in ten years with skill and fidelity. Mr. Jowett, an English clergyman, saw and bought this manuscript for the British and Foreign Missionary Society. Before the whole of this translation had been published (the four Gospels and Acts, 1822), Mr. Jowett succeeded in having two Gospels translated into the Tigré language by Pearce. Now the English Episcopal Missionary Society resolved to establish a mission in Abyssinia, and Samuel Gobat, now Bishop of Jerusalem, and Mr. Kugler were sent, and arrived there in 1830. But Mr. Kugler died, and Gobat had to return to Europe for help. His strictly evangelical method of operation made a very favorable impression upon princes, priests and the people, and the foundation of an evangelical reformation had evidently been laid by him, the assertions of Baron von

Katte to the contrary notwithstanding. Gobat returned with Isenberg, followed by Blumhard and Krapf, but had to leave again on account of sickness, and the other missionaries did not get beyond Tigré on account of the political convulsions of the country. Through the intrigues of the Italian missionary, Sapeta, the English missionaries were banished in 1838, and one year afterward the other missionaries had to follow them. The present Abuna, Abba Salama, is a pupil of the English protestant mission of Cairo; but, influenced by the Jesuits, the Etshege and the greater part of the clergy, turned against him and pronounced the sentence of deposition against him. He protested, but had to flee from Gondor and take refuge in a cloister in Tigré, till Cassai,—now king Theodorus—made himself king of Amhara. He recalled and reinstated the exiled Abuna, and banished the Jesuits at once. In 1854 Tigré was also conquered by king Theodorus, and the Jesuits had to leave it also.

The coöperation of the ecclesiastical and the political government of Abyssinia seems to be completely harmonious at present. The king is revered by the priests, and still more by the people, as a kind of Paraclete, and is regarded as that Theodotus, who will come, at the end of days, to establish a kingdom of perfect children. In 1855 bishop Gobat sent the three missionaries, Krapf, Martin and Flad to the king, to offer him “useful people”—mechanics, and to treat with him concerning the re-opening of a mission. They reached his camp, April 19th, were introduced at once to the Abuna, who accompanies the king on his military expeditions, and the day following had an audience of the king. Both the king and the Abuna received them very kindly; the offer of mechanics, as made by Gobat, was thankfully received, and for a beginning, three mechanics, viz: a printer, an architect, and a gunsmith were asked for. Should he—the king—be satisfied with them, and they with him, he would send for more. The king sent the following letter to bishop Gobat: “May this letter, which is sent by Theodorus, the God-ordained

king of kings (of Ethiopia) reach the English bishop, Gobat, of Jerusalem. Art thou well? The letter, which thou hast sent me through Krapf, Martin and Flad, I have received. I have been pleased, that thou inquierest after me. If these men remain (with thee), keep them, and if they come send them to me. And if the men, of whom thou hast spoken, say, we will go (to Abyssinia) I will receive and send them in love. I am pleased that thou sayest, I will send thee laborers (mechanics); send them to me. But thou knowest the condition of our country, in which thou wast. We were formerly divided into three parties (about the three births), but now I have brought about unity, with the help of God. Priests, who subvert our faith, shall not come, lest love cease. Formerly the so-called Pater Jacob came and annulled (our baptism) and ordination, substituting his in their place and causing many to apostatize. But, with the help of God, I have expelled and banished him. But if another priest comes, I will receive him kindly and send him back kindly, and if he wishes to remain, I shall cheerfully grant him permission to remain (in my country.) One of the laborers shall bring the thing that plows with a fire-screw, for I have heard that there is such a thing as plows with a fire-screw (steam-plow). And thou inquire after me and I shall inquire after thee. In order to please God, I forbade, through the herald, the slave trade, two years ago."

This change for the better has induced a number of German missionary societies to turn their attention anew to Abyssinia, but nothing decisive will be done in the matter, as we are informed, until full information is obtained concerning the state of affairs through bishop Gobat, who is expected to attend the Christian Alliance in Berlin this year.

THE ARMENIAN CHURCH.

The Christian religion was introduced into Armenia in the second century, and universally established in the third, under Tiridates, by Gregory the Illuminator. The Bible was translated (the Old Testament from the LXX) into

Armenian about 410, by Mesrob, the inventor of the Armenian Alphabet, and his two pupils, John Ekelensis and Joseph Planensis. The Armenian church separated in the sixth and seventh centuries from the Catholic (church) and adopted the monophysitic tenets. Their creed is as follows :

"We profess and believe in God the Father, who is uncreated, without beginning, who begets the Son and sends the Holy Ghost. We believe in God the Word, not created, but begotten by the Father from all eternity. We believe in God the Holy Ghost, who is uncreated, not begotten, but proceeds from the Father and partakes of the Son's glory. We believe in the Holy Trinity, one substance, one Deity, not three Gods, but one God, one will, one kingdom, one power, Creator of all things. We believe in the forgiveness of sins, in the Holy Church, and in the communion of saints. We believe, that one of the three persons, the Word, begotten of the Father before all eternity, descended in the fulness of time to our earth and became, although he was perfect God, a perfect man with spirit, soul and body, one person, one Attribute, and one common nature; God became man without change. As there is no beginning of his divinity, so there is no end of his humanity. For Jesus Christ is the same yesterday to-day and the same in all eternity. His body, united with His divinity, was laid in the grave, and in spirit, united with His divinity, He descended into hell, preached to the spirits, destroyed hell and set the spirits free. We believe, that our Lord Jesus Christ ascended with the same body into heaven and sat down at the right hand of the Father; in the same body He will come again. We believe in a reward of works, everlasting life of the righteous, and everlasting misery of the wicked."

An independent Armenian state has not existed for many centuries; since the Russians have conquered the province of Eriwan the centre of the Armenian Church has been in Russia; but there are many Armenians also in other provinces of Russia, in Turkey, in India and in Austria. The Armenians remind one of the Jews; they have, (like them,) no political independence, are scattered over many

countries, are oppressed and persecuted wherever they are, follow mercantile pursuits, etc. The Armenian Church is divided into two hostile parts or factions, viz: the Armenians properly so called, who reject the supremacy of the bishop of Rome; and the united Armenians, who recognize it. The latter have patriarchs at Venice, Constantinople and Lemberg, and a celebrated convent near Venice, San Lazaro. We shall confine ourselves in this article to the Armenians properly so-called. They believe with the orthodox Greek Church, that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father alone, that Christ has saved us from original sin, and that this salvation is appropriated by baptism; actual sins are remitted through confession. They have the same sacraments which the Church of Rome has, and attach great importance to fasting. Their motto is: "By Adam's eating we have been made worldly; we must, therefore, fast again, that we may return to our original being and lay aside our worldliness." As to alms, one particular form is this: they go on a Sunday or festival to a certain holy place, have a sheep consecrated by the priest with salt and prayer, which they afterwards kill, partly eat themselves, and partly give to the priest and the poor. This sacrifice is said to date from the times of Gregory, and an atoning power is claimed for it. Baptism is administered by immersion, and is followed by confirmation and extreme unction. They believe in transubstantiation and consider the mass as a real sacrifice. They pray to the saints, especially to the Virgin Mary;—whilst they reject the Catholic doctrine of purgatory, they believe in an intermediate state.

At the head of the Armenian Church stands the Catholicos, who resides in the convent Echmiadzin, near Eriwan, and is appointed by the (Russian) Emperor from a number of persons proposed by the archbishops as fit for the post. The Catholicos, is assisted by a committee of five Bishops and Vartabeds, who discuss the affairs of the Church and thus exert great influence. The Catholicos has the exclusive right to consecrate the holy oil, and derives large revenues from the sale of this article. Next to him are the

archbishops or metropolitans, who reside for the most part, likewise, in convents; then follow the Vartabeds or doctors, who are said to be well versed in the Old and New Testament and the doctrines of their Church; preaching is their exclusive calling.

The priests, who are married, but only once, are chosen by the congregations and receive tithes, perquisites and presents. Their priesthood has seven degrees, viz: priest, deacon, sub-deacon, torch-bearer, exorcist, reader and janitor. In order to become priest, the candidate must be twenty-five years of age. They have many convents, all of the order of St. Basilus, from which the Vartabeds proceed.

The reports concerning the condition of the Armenian Church are, on the whole, unfavorable. To some protestant missionaries, who represented to an Armenian bishop, that it was the duty of the Armenian Church to labor for the conversion of the Turks, he is said to have replied: "What shall we preach to the Mohammedans? for they believe in the same God in which we believe, and love good prayers." The missionaries urged, that there was a great difference between Christianity and Islamism, and that the heaven of the Christian religion is infinitely purer than the paradise of the Mohammedans. Then the bishop replied: "I must tell you, what one of our Vartabeds once said to a Moslem: if I were sure that your paradise really existed, I should wish to be there." For several decades protestant missionaries have labored for the amelioration of the religious condition of the Armenians, and there are small Armenian protestant societies at Constantinople, Brusa, Trebizond, Erzroom, Aintab, Ada-Basar, Nicomedia and other places. Many evangelical Armenians have become missionaries amongst their countrymen. In Bebek, near Constantinople, there is a seminary for the education of Armenians, and many missionaries have been trained there already. It is true, the evangelical Armenians form as yet but a small minority, but there is reason to hope, that they will work like leaven amongst their countrymen.

ART. VII.—EVERY MAN IS THE LORD'S IN DEATH: A DISCOURSE
BY DR. RAUCH.

"For whether we live, we live unto the Lord; and whether we die, we die unto the Lord: whether we live, therefore, or die, we are the Lord's." Rom. 14: 8.

PART SECOND.*

I intend to prove to-day from the latter part of my text,
1. That the sinner, when he dies is the Lord's, and will be judged by Him; and

2. That the believer is the Lord's when he dies, though in a sense entirely different from that of the former.

First, then, I shall endeavor to prove that the sinner is the Lord's when he dies, although he does not acknowledge it.

The *whole* life of man is enveloped in darkness, but its duration and its exit still more so. Whilst imagining himself the master and lord of his life, of his destiny, of his actions and plans, the sinner must nevertheless sooner or later experience, that, whatever he may undertake and complete during his life, in death he is no longer master of himself; or does any one of us know even when his last hour will approach; when he shall see for the last time the cheerful light of the sun, and enjoy for the last time the well known countenance of his friends and relatives on earth; when he shall part with the sweet habit of conversing with his acquaintances? His last hour is appointed in the councils of Him, that gave him life and existence, but he does not know it. The place whither he will be called; the circumstances under which, and the age of his life, when he must depart; all were determined upon before he was born, but he was not consulted and does not know them. Death approaches him unsuspectedly. Whilst in the midst of plans; whilst he, in his imagination and in the vigor of

* For Part First see the April Number, 1859, p. 222.

health, calculates on enjoyments in after years ; whilst his ever-blooming hopes urge his mind forward to enter new occupations, to engage in new schemes of activity, he is like the lamb that plays when the sun sets, but is sacrificed on the following morning. He lives and never thinks of death ; he walks on the ashes of his departed friends and sees his own grave, but continues to act as if he should live forever. Proud mortal ! you feel yourself a free, an active, a reasonable, a considerate being during life, but in that momentous hour, which your thoughts abhor, when you must part with this world and enter another, you are no longer free, no longer active, no longer considerate. You feel yourself strong and full of invention and art, but that power, which calls you, you do not know whither, is invisible to your eye, and irresistible to your hand. You must follow its call, for you are not your own master ; you must go into eternity, though you never think of it. No ties that you have formed on earth, no calls and claims, no wishes or tears, no strength, no designs can protect you from this invisible power : it beckons and without being consulted you must follow ; it touches you and you sink a corpse. Are you not the servant of a higher master ?

Who of us could or would deny the fact, that none of us is his own master in that mournful moment when at once, by one stroke, the blood ceases to circulate, the heart to beat, and the spirit of life to act ; when the eye is sealed, the ear deaf, and the limbs are cold ; when friends, children, parents, sisters and brothers stand around the bed anxiously awaiting that life perhaps may return, that the eye may open, the heart beat again ; when it seems impossible that he who a little before still felt, thought, acted, should be gone forever, that his soul should be separated by immense space from them and perhaps neither see their tears nor hear their sighs ? Man is no longer his master in that mournful hour, when we follow his remains to the grave to inter them in the narrow and solitary house. From that hour silence, deep silence, reigns around his grave, and no sound reaches our ear from below the earth.

He has gone to the shores of eternity, without knowing the path; for he was the Lord's when he died and He led him. He was for us as long as he lived, now he is no more for us. His body begins to be changed and repels all the living from it, to prove that he is now under the law of a Being over whom he has no command, and that it is in vain to weep and mourn whenever the face of man has disappeared.

How well is this truth calculated to teach us that we are all the Lord's. Old and young; he whose head bends towards the earth, and he whose mind teems with hopes and expectation—all die without distinction. Every moment calls thousands into existence and sends thousands into the grave; and of those many thousands who dare say that he will not be one now or but a little hereafter? O let us live unto the Lord, that we may die unto him!

Dying, the sinner is the Lord's, *though against his will and wishes*. The materialist and the pantheist, the infidel and the sceptic, all are united in the wish, that when the soul leaves the body, it may be destroyed. Though they have the consent of all nations against them, yet their life, their character, their sensual will, can not endure the idea that the soul is the Lord's, and that He calls it when we die. As little as the insanity of many thousands can prove any thing against the generality of human reason, so little, it is true, should the arguments of a few materialists against the immortality of the soul be able to alarm us; it is, therefore, not on account of the believer, but on account of the sinner, that I have determined to review a few of their doubts and assertions.

And here I must allude, above all, to Pliny, the elder, whose learning was great, whose works were known among the ancients, and what is left of them excites even now our astonishment; yet his arguments for the annihilation of the soul are puerile and ridiculous. What—he asks—is the soul good for without eyes and ears, if it can not smell nor taste? And where shall place enough be found for so many souls? Such arguments deserve certainly no refu-

tation, and yet it is a fact, that can not be denied, that nearly all the reasons of the materialist essentially terminate in this puerile idea. The body, they say, the organ of the soul, conditions the life of the latter. On the strength and energy of our nerves and muscles depends that of our will and our thoughts; when they grow weak, our faculties grow dull, the memory fails, and the vigor of our judgment diminishes; when we lose one of our limbs the soul is deprived of those sensations and perceptions which were obtained by impressions on the lost member; and when the whole body is destroyed, it follows that the soul will be extinguished like a light, since what is true of a part must be true also of the whole.

This is the highest point of the materialist's arguments, and whilst I am willing to admit, that the soul is so constituted that it is active through organs, and that it could not reach its destination independently of them, I must insist, at the same time, on the strictest distinction between a power that acts through organs and the organs themselves. The organs serve the soul and differ from it as the instrument on which the artist plays, differs from his art. When the organ is destroyed, the power that acted through it, remains still the same power, though its activity may seem to be impaired. That when our organs grow weak our memory and judgment grow dull, is but one part of our experience; the other is, that just in the moment of death the long lost faculties frequently obtain their youthful vigor anew; that the dying man can speak languages which he had forgotten; that all his faculties concentrated on one point, as if freed from all earthly chains, victoriously rise to a height which they never would have been able to reach in the time when muscles and nerves were strongest. When one of our organs suffers partial insanity takes place, says the materialist; but what this fact goes to prove he overlooks; the very insanity is a continuance of the activity of the soul which, though acting through organs, acts also independently of them. When a limb is lost the feelings and sensations the person had through

it, are lost likewise, and yet experience proves that men who have lost a hand, feel in it every change of weather and even pains, as if it were yet in connexion with the arm. To be sure, this is imagination; but imagination is neither nerve nor brain; it is an activity of the soul. As little as our faculties harden with the brain in the skull, so little is the soul but bone and sinew; for if it were, how should men that had lost one of their faculties during some part of their life, regain it just at a time when it could be least expected. Let us ask the physician, whether the body, with all its fibres and elements, does not undergo constant changes, and yet our mental faculties remain the same. Let us ask him whether he has never met with men, who, by strange misfortunes, had lost one member after the other, until nothing was left but head and breast, and yet they were mentally the same that they always had been. History records instances where important portions of the brain were destroyed, and some, where the whole brain was removed, yet the mind was still active.

The soul is neither the brain nor a system of nerves and muscles; it is spirit, and whilst our body, a living composition, each particle of which is animated and has a particular design, may be subject to death and be dissolved into its original elements, the soul is no composition: it is something entirely internal, invisible, immaterial, spiritual, not subject to changes, neither in space, for it has no extension; nor in time, for that which is entirely simple has no succession. Death is separation; but can that be separated which does not consist of parts? Death reigns only where it can cause separation; over the soul it has no dominion, for it consists not of plurality, though its faculties are many, but of a unity of all of them. But further: though death, this dreadful destroyer of all, may decompose, it can not annihilate a single atom; all that dies and decays in nature, passes only from one form into another; every particle enters a new combination, a new life; and is the soul, the power of thought, the consciousness of ourselves and our Lord—the soul, for which the body was created, alone capable of being annihilated?

But what is the soul? the materialist asks. We reply: You think, you will, you resolve, you act; do you need a further proof of what your soul is? It is neither light, nor flame, nor fire; nor air, nor breath; it is nothing that can be seen, or heard, or perceived by the senses, or represented by pictures;—it is not confined to space, nor to time; it mocks at distance; it scorns mere external form; now it is beyond the stars and suns, and now again within itself; now it wills something and without loss of time it acts through the arm. A passion rises in it, a wish, a desire, and all veins beat higher, the heart swells, the blood rolls, the nerves are invigorated and the will of the soul passes through the whole body with the swiftness of lightning. Now it calls forth the remembrance of by-gone ages, thinks eternity, and creates a world of spirits and beings which it never has seen. It is the soul that unites the many impressions received into one thought and brings the many individual things under one head; it was the soul, and not the eye that, when the apple fell in a happy moment, discovered the law of gravity. And this soul that by one great idea triumphs even over the pains of death, can it be annihilated?

There is some flaw in this lifeless, sensual system of materialism, which made even La Mettrie confess, that he could not find in his mind a consoling idea. "*If I am, thou art not, and if thou art, I am not*"; and in neither case do I need to fear thee." This would be the keen expression of the infidel, but La Mettrie could not say so, for he did not and could not believe in his own system.

But there is another class of sinners that cannot convince themselves, that when they die, they are the Lord's. Whilst the materialist and the pantheist deny the immortality of the soul, because they suffer from relaxation and weakness, because they are satisfied with their merely sensual life and entertain the principle that man's destination is to live, to enjoy himself, to be useful and to die; because they fear the doctrines of the gospel and a meeting with the Saviour as the Judge of the world;—there are those

who would believe, if they could only convince themselves by their eyes and senses. For six thousand years death has kept silence ; we have buried our children and parents, our most beloved friends and relatives from year to year—but around their graves no sound of life is to be heard, the house of the dead is dark and cold and never gives back its inhabitant. This it is, that they can not understand. If their souls live, where are they ? Why do they not appear to us ? If we are born for immortality, why are we forbidden to cast a glance into the world beyond the stars ?

To answer these really important questions, I might direct your attention to nature and show how a wise and kind Providence has every where given us as much as was necessary and neither *more* nor *less*. All the gifts of the animal are calculated according to its wants, and whilst the Deity was not parsimonious in giving those necessary for its existence, neither was he prodigal in granting such as would have been of no immediate use. The wandering bird, that passes from one country to another, knows nothing of its clime, of its productions, of the path that leads thither ; yet yielding to the impulse it feels to commence its migration, it enters upon it and reaches the country. Would the same bird, if it knew the dangers awaiting it, the labor and fatigue resulting from its journey, not perhaps rather choose to remain back, and thus by encountering privations which its constitution was not made to endure, find an early death ? Yet I do not wish to gain my point by the easy way of a comparison, and shall therefore ask : Why is it, that there is no connexion between the dead and the living ?

We all are called to act out the design which God had in view in creating this world. Each one of us occupies his place by divine Providence, not by his own choice ; and though none of us may carry out his own designs and plans, yet as a link in the great chain, he on his part promotes the general design of God. But what man would desire any longer to remain and work in this world, after he had once cast a glance into eternity ? Having seen the glories

of heaven we would forget the work which is our daily duty; we would scorn those pleasures, which constitute a part of our earthly existence; we would find those hopes insignificant, which we must entertain to live and to breathe; we would think it superfluous to project plans for the future; and our diligence and cheerfulness in this world would be gone. We are born to be citizens of two worlds; of the world below and of that above; both these worlds are separated from each other by fixed limits, and that which unites them is *love, faith and hope*. Whilst we live on earth, it is our destination to act out the plan of God on earth, and to look forth into the world to come with the eye of faith. Lest we should become confused, lest our souls should receive impressions that might disturb their peace, follow them day and night and render them unfit for duties on earth—God has kindly hidden from mortal eye what he has prepared for man in eternity.

Again: suppose we were permitted to see the fate of our beloved friends in eternity, could we do so without participating in it? Would we not feel with them? Perhaps some of them have to suffer punishment—if we truly love them, would we be strong enough to bear this grief? Would not the painful feeling of compassion embitter the enjoyments of life? Now we know that the dead are the Lord's, and though the Scriptures are no where explicit as to the condition of the departed from the time of death till the day of judgment, we know that they are in the hands of a just but merciful, of a holy but loving, Father; that those who die in the Lord will rest in the Lord, will be with the Lord.

Yet we are foolish and ignorant mortals. We can not calculate with certainty on events, that will occur in a few days, and we desire to look into eternity. We, made of flesh and bones, desire to know the fate and destinies of those who no more are flesh and blood, who now serve higher purposes of our Creator. We can not compass the Kingdom of God on earth, nor review His plans which are before us; yet we are anxious to understand all about God's

kingdom in Heaven, and if we are denied this understanding we have no courage to believe, but doubt and hesitate.

Much stronger than all the arguments of the sinner against the immortality of the soul, are the demands of reason for it.

Every faculty of the soul conceals in itself the germ of eternity; the design for which the soul was created, never being realized on earth, demands a life after death. The animal possesses all its skill, all its abilities and the use of all its members from the very commencement of its life, and whether it dies early or late, its destiny has been fulfilled. But the soul, when it has reached the highest degree of cultivation, is still infinitely perfectible; and in proportion as it develops itself does its perfection appear still more remote. Without immortality we would, therefore, never realize our original design. We have ideas of truth, of virtue, of absolute love: but as long as we live on earth, they exist only in idea, and not in reality. Eternity alone can realize them.

And this remark is not isolated: nature has a number of parallels. Many animals destined to pass from a lower to a higher state of development, have organs which they do not stand in need of until they are transformed. This we find to be the case especially among insects; natural philosophers give it as a general rule, that every original disposition and natural tendency finds its time and place of perfection. The tortoise, which is hatched several miles from the sea, runs down in a straight line, without a teacher, into the water in which it never has been. The migratory bird, following the current of the atmosphere and its own instinct, seeks and finds a new country. Every want has its means of satisfaction; the lungs have the air adapted to breathing, and the eye has the light adapted to sight; but shall that longing and desire which man has, remain unsatisfied?

We see further, that the noblest purposes have never been carried into effect, that the purest feelings are of the shortest duration; and when in history we meet now and then with a wise and good man who scattered his thoughts

and counsels and deeds into the flood of time, we perceive but a few waves circling around them, and shortly after the stream tearing them away and leaving no vestige behind. We see that fools reign over the councils of the wise, that profligates inherit the property of prudent parents, that the righteous suffer and the wicked frequently enjoy honor and happiness on earth : we feel that this is not right, and shall there be no state in which all shall be made equal, and every one receive according to his works ?

Finally, we, alone of all that lives on earth, know that we must die ; we fear death as a dire necessity ; and feeling averse to destruction, we long for immortality. Should God, who deceives none of his creatures, have planted in our nature this longing, without being willing to satisfy it ? We are able to conceive an eternity and shall we never obtain it ? No, the very thought of eternity is the earnest of eternity itself ; and however the sinner may desire the opposite, when he dies he must live again ; he passes only from the scenes of this world to appear before his Master, who gave him life and to whom he must render an account of all that he has done. He is the Lord's when he lives ; he is the Lord's when he dies. This truth he must hear, and tremble ; he wills it not, and yet he can not deny it. It is a necessity which he can not avoid by any power of earth or of hell. As certain as it is that he must die, so certain it is, that he must live again, for he must be judged.

II.

We have seen that the sinner is the Lord's when he dies, though against his will ; for if it were in his power or choice, he would rather be destroyed forever, than fall into the hands of the living God. In a sense diametrically opposed to this is the Christian, the true believer—the Lord's. He has been purchased by the blood of Christ and is His thus ; he has been regenerated by the agency of the Holy Spirit ; his will has been divested of all egotism ; his breast has been filled with love ; eternal heavenly love to Him who redeemed him, and hence he is the Lord's internally by his own will and desire. Christ is the centre of all his

activity; and whatever he does, has a bearing on Christ's cause. The Father's will is the Christian's will; all opposition has been removed and the whole life of the believer is a spiritual one, is a dying in the Lord. Nevertheless he lives, yet not he, but Christ lives in him, and the life which he now lives in the flesh, he lives by the faith of the Son of God, who loved him and gave Himself for him. When his last hour approaches, he sinks into the hands not of a strange God, but of his Master, matured for eternity, full of desire to enter his home, full of hope to participate in the praises and hallelujahs which angels sing to the Lord of creation. His soul rises, therefore, the more free and easy on the wings of faith, the deeper time and space sink below it. His is the salvation of which those will partake who on earth were members of Christ's kingdom. He will see the King of all heavens, the Lamb full of meekness and kindness, the elect multitude, chosen to reign with Him, saints, angels and archangels, all of whom praise and adore Him.

This is the hope that raises the spirit of the dying Christian, that makes him say: whether I die, or whether I live, I am the Lord's. And this is not merely a picture sketched by imagination, but a promise, given to believers by the Gospel. Paul in many places warns the sinner to be watchful, since the day of the Lord will so come as a thief in the night; in others he teaches, in accordance with Christ's own words, that He will descend from Heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and with the trump of God; the dead in Christ shall rise first, and those which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air and so shall they ever be with the Lord. Not only does he teach the immortality of the soul, but distinctly too the resurrection of the body. In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump, the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed; for this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. The soul shall then continue to be not without a body, but

the body it will receive will be a spiritual, a heavenly one. And when Christ comes on that day, He will not only awaken men from death, but sit in judgment on every idle word that men have spoken; they will have to give an account, and He will render to every man according to his deeds, to them who by patient continuance in well-doing seek for glory and honor and immortality—eternal life; but unto them that are contentious and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness—indignation and wrath. And glorious will He be in His judgment, invested with the power of the Father. And I saw a great white throne and Him that sat on it, from whose face the heaven and the earth fled away and there was found no place for them. And I saw the dead, small and great, standing before God: and the books were opened: among them the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them; and they were judged every man according to his works. And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire. (Rev. 20: 11-15.)

What power! Earth and heaven flee before Him; and in the immense, empty space He sits on His throne, and around Him are the hosts of the dead waiting to be judged; finally death and the kingdom of darkness appear before Him and are cast into the eternal lake of fire. For that is the end, that Christ shall reign until all His enemies shall be made his footstool; and he that has the power of death shall be destroyed. And after all that is evil has been sunk into eternal night, "God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes, and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying; for the former things are passed away."

But who are those that will enter this new Jerusalem and inherit this heavenly blessedness? "They which came out of great tribulation and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb. Therefore are

they before the throne of God, and serve him day and night in His temple; and He that sitteth on the throne shall dwell among them. They shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more, neither shall the sun light on them, nor any heat. For the Lamb, which is in the midst of the throne, shall feed them and shall lead them unto living fountains of waters." And what will be this New Jerusalem? The building of the wall of it was of jasper and the city was of pure gold and like unto clear glass. And the foundations of the wall of the city were garnished with all manner of precious stones. And the twelve gates were twelve pearls; every several gate was of one pearl. And there shall be no night there; and they need no candle, neither light of the sun; for the Lord God giveth them light. And he showed me a pure river of water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb; in the midst of the street of it and on either side of the river was there the tree of life, which bear twelve manner of fruits and yielded her fruit every month: and the leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations.

Are these but pictures? Or do they represent the renovation of all nature, which, according to Paul, waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God? Does not the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews say the same thing? But you are come unto mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and Church of the first born, which are written in Heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect. John the divine, himself says: He that sat on the throne, said, Behold, I make all things new. And he said unto me, write: for these words are faithful and true. I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last.

Blessed are they that do His commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city.

ART. VIII.—RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

ON CIVIL LIBERTY AND SELF-GOVERNMENT. By Francis Lieber, LL. D., Corresponding Member of the Institute of France, etc., Author of "Political Ethics," "Principles of Legal and Political Interpretation," etc., etc. Enlarged Edition in one volume. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippencott. London: Trübner & Co., 1859.

It is remarkable that the two most profound and instructive works on the philosophy of American institutions should have been written, the one by a Frenchman—the late Mr. de Tocqueville, the other by a German—Prof. Lieber, formerly Professor of History and Political Science in the State College of South Carolina, and since 1857 in Columbia College, New York. And yet the fact is easily explained. A thoroughly educated and liberal minded foreigner, coming to us with a full knowledge of European monarchies, and residing among us sufficiently long to study the theory and working of the American republic, under all its forms and aspects, has better opportunities and advantages for a comparative discussion of the various systems of government than any native American. Besides it is characteristic of the German mind, and also of the more reflective and serious class of Frenchmen, such as de Tocqueville and Guizot, to trace historical institutions to their origin, to exhibit their gradual growth, to show their relative necessity, their general bearings upon, and connections with, the national life and the state of the world at large; while the English and American mind is mainly concerned with the knowledge of present facts and duties. The more speculative German wants to know *how* and *why* a thing became as it is; the more practical American is satisfied to know *that* it is and *what* it is. The one looks at the *Werden* or the genesis, the other at the *Ge-wordensein* or the result.

The American system of government belongs to the Teutonic and more particularly the Anglican order as distinct from the Romanic. It shares with the government of old England

the common law, trial by jury, popular representation and legislation, self-taxation, publicity of proceeding, subjection of the army and navy to the legislature, liberty of speech and the press, division of power, and all those forms, guarantees and checks which constitute and uphold the only rational and possible form of national liberty—that which is based upon the moral power of self-government and the absolute supremacy of law. But, in addition to this, the American system implies some important original features, as republican federalism, greater equality, and the strict separation of the secular and spiritual power; while England is a constitutional monarchy, essentially aristocratic in its social structure, and still holds to the principle of state-churchism, or an established religion. The North American republic, the only one deserving the name in the Western hemisphere, is the greatest experiment of self-government which has yet been made in history, and the whole civilized world is interested in its ultimate success or failure. Such a government is eminently worthy of profound historical and philosophical study in comparison with other and opposite forms of government, especially the French centralization system, which is essentially despotic and which now, under its most consistent, imposing and brilliant form, that of Napoleonic imperialism, is again controlling the destinies and threatening the liberty and independence of continental Europe.

We know of no better guide in such study than this book of Prof. Lieber. It is based upon mature knowledge, long observation, and a just sense of the frailty and dignity of man as being too feeble to wield unlimited power, and yet too noble to submit to it. There runs through it a certain vein of vanity in the frequent recurrence of the little word *I*, which should be excluded from scientific works, and the references to the other works of the author. But while we regret this little weakness in a gentleman of such superior literary talent and attainments, it cannot blind us to the high merits of the work. It is eminently calculated to strengthen the attachment to the English and American form of government in preference to the French, or any other which now obtains in the civilized world. We read the first edition which appeared in 1853, with more than usual interest, and have glanced at the second, which is somewhat enlarged with such remarks, mostly in the form of notes, which the political experience of the last few years has

suggested. But the only addition of importance seems to be the insertion of the French Constitution of 1793, as contrasted with the American, in the Appendix N. XI. p. 536, sqq. *P. S.*

AN AMERICAN DICTIONARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE, etc., etc. By Noah Webster, etc. Revised and enlarged by Chauncy A. Goodrich, etc. To which are now added PICTORIAL ILLUSTRATIONS, etc. Springfield, Mass.: G. & M. Merriam. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippencott & Co., 1859.

This new edition of Webster's unabridged Dictionary, which will hereafter go by the name of the Pictorial edition, contains not only all the matter of the previous revised editions, but several new features which give it a decided preference before all others. In the first place we have here an addition of not less than fifteen hundred pictorial illustrations of terms in architecture, geometry, heraldry, coats of arms, mechanics, botany, ornithology, natural history, geology, mythology, antiquities, etc. These illustrations of things which admit of a better definition by an engraving than in words, were first introduced into Dr. Ogilvie's Imperial Dictionary (which is substantially an English reprint of Webster) in 1847, and are here executed with a high degree of artistic skill and taste. They are not scattered through the vocabulary, as in the English work, but placed by themselves and classified under leading or generic terms with a subordinate-alphabetical arrangement and references to the pages of the vocabulary where the words occur. The value and use of such pictorial illustrations, especially for children and young scholars is obvious. Some of the pictures, however, might have been left out, as the organ-grinder, the lady in hoops, and the old witch riding through the air with a broom-stick. The new edition contains also a valuable table of several hundred synonyms, alphabetically arranged and defined with accurate discrimination by Prof. Chauncey A. Goodrich of Yale College, (p. CLXV—CCXXXIV); an appendix to the vocabulary, embracing nearly ten thousand new words and definitions (p. 1283—1363); tables of Scripture names, Greek and Latin proper names and modern geographical names, exhibiting the pronunciation of each, prepared under the direction of Prof. N. Porter (p. 1365—1458); a pronouncing vocabu-

lary of proper names of distinguished individuals of modern times (p. 1459-1493); and finally a list of familiar quotations, words, phrases and colloquial expressions from the Latin, French, Italian and Spanish, rendered into English by William G. Webster (p. 1495-1504).

With these additions, by different hands, Webster's Dictionary has become a real lexicographical Encyclopedia, perhaps more so than any other work of the kind. This completeness of vocabulary and auxiliary information, together with the acknowledged merit of its definitions which convey the necessary information in the simplest and clearest common sense terms, will always secure Webster's Dictionary a preëminent place among its predecessors and rivals, and make it indispensable for a long time to come.

Nevertheless it is still open to serious objections and admits of material improvements, which the enterprising publishers would do well to incorporate in some future edition. Without claiming any superior knowledge of English lexicography, we may as well explain ourselves on this occasion more fully.

Our first objection is to the etymologies of Webster's Dictionary, especially the German part, which is the most important, since about two thirds of the English vocabulary is Saxon or Teutonic. These are not only defective, but in many instances incorrect, and should be subjected to a thorough revision by a master of the entire field of Teutonic and comparative philology, including, of course, the Sanscrit, the mother of the Indo-Germanic family of languages. We saw it stated recently that the editors have employed a learned German professor for this very purpose, but we heard nothing as yet of the result of his labors.

The second defect is the external and mechanical collocation of the different meanings of words without reference either to their historical development or their logical connection. In this, as well as in the etymological part, we greatly prefer the plan of Richardson's English, Gesenius' Hebrew, and Pape's Greek and Grimm's German Dictionary. The primitive meaning should always be given first, and then the other meanings should follow in the order of time and logical sequence, accompanied in each case with appropriate quotations from the classics of the different ages. Thus the definitions would present

a history of the respective words and the progress of the English language and literature down to American usage.

The third and most general, although in our estimation less serious objection to Webster, is his orthography, which has provoked great hostility to it, especially in England. We are not opposed to his innovations altogether, especially those which would have gradually obtained and were making their way without, and even before, his agency, such as the dropping of the *k* and *u* in a number of words. But we object to his want of system and wish the changes so modified and reduced as to retain, as much as possible, the traces of the origin of words.—The regard to simplicity and sound, which he seems to have consulted exclusively, should be regulated and controlled by the *etymological* principle. Hence we do not plead at all for the restoration of *k* in *public*, *music*, *physic*, etc., for the simple reason that it is useless in itself and obscures the Latin origin of these words from *publicus*, etc. Just as little do we advocate the *u* in *favor* and *honor*, because the omission brings these words nearer the pronunciation and the original Latin *favor* and *honor*, from which the French *faveur* and *honneur* are derived. But for the same etymological reason we greatly prefer *antique* (Latin *antiquus*, French *antique*) to *antic* or *antick*, and *centre* (Greek *σέντρον*, Latin *centrum*, French *centre*) to *center*. The same applies to *metre*, *mitre*, *theatre*, *sceptre*, *sabre*, *calibre*, *lustre*, where Webster substitutes likewise *er* for *re*, without giving any object but that of observing the etymology and introducing confusion. The dropping of the *o* in *oeconomical* and *oecumenical*, of a in *aesthetical* is likewise a violation of the etymological canon. Webster's omission of the double consonant in *travelling*, *levelling*, *counselling*, *duelling* and similar verbs, might perhaps be defended on the ground of the accent being on the antepenultima. But it is apt to introduce confusion, since Webster himself retains the double consonant in all those participles where the accent is on the penultima, as in *referring* from *refer*, *controlling*, from *control*. And then he is justly chargeable with inconsistency in *doubling* the consonant in many other cases against the general usage, as in *fullfill* for *fulfil*, *controll* for *control*, *enroll* for *enrol*, *distill* for *distil*, *skillfull* for *skillful*, *willfull* for *wilful*, although in several of these instances he has the etymology (*vollfullen*, *willvoll*, etc.) on his side. Upon the whole

it would have been far better if he had adhered to the usual mode of spelling, except in about half a dozen instances, which commend themselves at once to common sense as improvements.

P. S.

HISTORICAL SKETCHES OF HYMNS, their Writers, and their Influence. By Joseph Belcher, D. D. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1859. Pages 415. (Price \$1.25.)

We welcome this work as a timely contribution to English hymnology. It contains a large amount of interesting and useful information, industriously collected from a variety of sources, and is gotten up in that chaste and elegant style which distinguishes the publications of Messrs. Lindsay & Blakiston.

We must, however, restrict the praise and recommendation of the book before us. The title would lead the reader to expect a work on general hymnology, while in fact it is confined simply to English hymnology. Of the sacred poetry of the ancient Greek and Latin Church we find only a few scattered and unsatisfactory notices in the Introduction; the German hymnology, the richest of all, seems to be a *terra incognita* to the author beyond a few fine sayings of Luther on the importance and use of poetry and music in public worship. The book, moreover, is not strictly scientific and critical, but a popular compilation for popular use. We would greatly prefer if Dr. Belcher—a Baptist minister from England who spent many years in this country, wrote a life of Whitefield and several devotional books and died at Philadelphia shortly after the completion of his hymnological work in manuscript—had indicated the authorities from which he derived his information. As it is, we have no dates to determine the accuracy of his statements. Finally, the plan and arrangement of the work, which is alphabetical, and not chronological, may be convenient for reference, but throws no light on the history and progress of hymnology. In all these respects it is not to be compared with Dr. Koch's *Geschichte des Kirchenlieds und Kirchengesangs* (in four vols.) and other German works on the same general subject.

Yet with all these defects the work is evidently a labor of love and the more to be valued as it seems to be the only book

of its kind on the *English* branch of Christian hymnology, on which Dr. Koch and other German hymnologists, give us no information whatever. And yet the English and Anglo-American hymnology, next to the German, is decidedly the richest in Christendom and is still growing. A few more books like that of Dr. Belcher, and the way will be sufficiently prepared for a critical and scholarly history of English hymnology. We are glad to see that our author is opposed to the propensity for arbitrary changes which seems to be spreading among recent compilers of American hymn books. In some cases changes are real improvements, or have been generally received, as John Wesley's

"Before Jehovah's awful throne
Ye nations bow with sacred joy,"

for Isaac Watt's original version of the hundredth Psalm:

"Nations attend before his throne,
With solemn fear, with sacred joy."

But "of every hundred of the changes," says Dr. Belcher, "at least ninety and nine are for the worse." (p. 63.) It is absolutely necessary, therefore, in making a choice selection of hymns, to go back to the original source and first inspiration of the poet. If the hymn is found to be objectionable on the ground of doctrine or religious sentiment, it should not be rejected at once; but if it breathe the genuine spirit of sacred poetry and of sound evangelical piety, it ought not to be changed, except for strong reasons of language or taste, and even in that case, always with great care, with a nice sense of responsibility and, if possible, in the very spirit and style of the author and his age.

P. S.

COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL OF JOHN. By Dr. Augustus Tholuck. Translated from the German by Charles P. Krauth, D. D. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co., No. 40, North Sixth street. 1859.

Another valuable contribution to Anglo-German theology and literature. Of Dr. Tholuck as a man, a Christian, a scholar and divine, we have spoken at length in our book on Germany and elsewhere. His name always awakens pleasant memories in our mind, since we spent six months in his house, and in his

almost daily intercourse. He is unquestionably one of the most interesting literary men of the age, especially to an American student travelling in Europe, and will always occupy a pre-eminent position in the history of the great revival of evangelical theology and piety in Germany. His Commentary on the Gospel of St. John is not near as *gründlich* and *erschöpfend* as his Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, or the last *Umarbeitung* of the Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. In its first editions it was even regarded as superficial and unsatisfactory in the exposition of the most difficult and important passages. But in its later editions it has undergone such material improvements that it now ranks among the best modern Commentaries on that Gospel which represents the holy of holies of the evangelical history, and is taken as it were from the very heart of Christ. Lücke is more thorough and elaborate; Olshausen has a peculiar flavor and unction; De Wette is more condensed, but less sound; Meyer more accurate in point of grammar and verbal criticism, though less satisfactory in theological expression; but Tholuck combines a variety of excellencies that adapt it especially to the wants of students, for whose benefit it was originally prepared. As to the translation, which is made from the sixth edition (1843) with additions from the seventh (1857), we take it for granted, without special examination, that our friend Dr. Krauth, from his talents and general attainments, his knowledge of, and taste for, the German language and literature, and his connection with the largest German denomination of this country, was as well qualified for this task as any American divine and has done full justice to the original.

P. S.

THE HISTORY of the Religious Movement of the Eighteenth Century called METHODISM, considered in its different denominational forms, and its relations to British and American Protestantism. By Abel Stevens, LL. D. Vol. II. From the death of Whitefield to the death of Wesley. New York: Publ. by Carlton & Porter, 200 Mulberry Street. 1859.

This is the second volume of an extensive, elaborate, well written and elegantly printed work, which promises to give a

more complete history of Methodism in the old and new world, from the Methodist and general Protestant point of view, than has yet been published either in England or in this country. It is intended to be a standard work "for reference, in respect to all important dates, proceedings of Methodist ecclesiastical bodies, decisions of theological questions, numerical returns, and other similar details." The two volumes so far published, bring the religious movement of Methodism, which exerted such a powerful influence over the Anglo-Saxon race in all parts of the globe, to the death of its founder. Another volume, we presume, will be necessary to complete its history in the old world, and at least two more for the history of American Methodism. If the remaining volumes follow the second in as rapid a succession as the second volume succeeded the first, we may see it completed in a few years. We have not been able to give this work such attention as it deserves, but hope at some future time to make it the basis of an independent article on the genius and mission of Methodism.

P. S.

A TREATISE ON THEISM AND THE MODERN SKEPTICAL THEORIES,
By Francis Wharton, Professor in Kenyon College, Ohio.
J. B. Lippincott, Phila. 1859.

This work consists of two parts. The first treats somewhat in detail of the evidences of the existence and character of God as they are given by conscience, the mind in general, nature, society, &c. The second, and larger part of the treatise, is employed in giving a condensed statement and refutation of various theories, which have obscured our knowledge of the Divine Being, or entirely ignored his proper and independent existence, such as the systems of an Imperfect Creator, Optimism, Positivism, Fatalism, Pantheism and Development. The latter we regard as the most valuable and important part of the book, inasmuch as it gives a bird's eye view of the various sceptical tendencies of the human mind in a popular form, so as to be accessible to the general reader. A large space is devoted to Positivism, the most recent and dangerous form of French infidelity, dangerous, because it professes to base itself upon the sciences, and proceeds, as must be admitted on all hands, from an author, who has an eminently scientific mind.

The refutation is popular in its character, ingenious, and, for the space allotted to it, complete. Positivism is the infidelity of the proud Scientist, who, accustomed to rigorous mathematical demonstrations and tangible experiments in his investigations, looks with disdain upon the provinces of Theology and Philosophy, and politely bows them out of the domain of established knowledge. Pantheism, on the other hand, is the error into which the profoundest and most earnest thinkers have fallen when no longer guided by the star of Divine Revelation. It has made its appearance wherever the human mind had attained to the highest degree of cultivation. It may indeed be regarded as the goal of all deep and earnest thinking in the sphere of nature, the necessary conclusion, to which all vigorous speculation that sets aside the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation, must sooner or later arrive. It is an intuition, we may say, of humanity itself, that, if the Deity exist as a living, active spirit, he should manifest and embody himself somewhere and in some way. Revelation teaches us that this embodiment is to be found in Christ, the Son of God, for in Him dwelleth the fulness of the God-head bodily, whilst the heathen or deist, if he be consequent, must make the world as a whole, or its particular departments, this embodiment, because he can find it no where else. Under this view, pantheism cannot be successfully refuted by one who occupies a common stand-point with the pantheist on the outside of Christianity. The chapter on Pantheism in Prof. Wharton's book, is, therefore, to us the least satisfactory. Moreover, it is treated in too summary a manner, and, although the objections to the system seem to be well taken, the author does not seem to feel the strength or charm which Pantheism must ever have for speculative minds, nor the deep root which it has in our common human nature.

The book is readable and interesting. It evinces an inquiring and cultivated mind, supplied with extensive reading in reference to the subject of which it treats. The illustrations are numerous, too much so perhaps, but generally happy in their character. Many of them are taken from our American soil, which gives a freshness to the discussions, which we do not meet with in other works of a similar character. As a popular work on an important subject we recommend it for general circulation. T. A.

THE CHRISTIAN HOME, AS IT IS IN THE SPHERE OF NATURE AND THE CHURCH. By Rev. Samuel Philips, A. M., Pastor of the first-German Reformed church, Chambersburg, Pa. Published by G. & F. Bill, Springfield, Mass. 1859.

We are happy to meet with the above book. It comes to us as a friend amid the most interesting, trying and solemn relations of life. It speaks of Home, a subject in regard to which we can never tire. We love to think of Home and dwell upon the various relations which it involves; and it is certainly true that the more deeply we penetrate these relations in the way of earnest thought and reflection, the more correctly will we understand the true philosophy of life; and the more freely we live in them, the more nearly will we approximate in fact the high Scriptural ideal of human existence.

In all the pages of this book the accomplished author has illustrated the fact that he wields the pen of a ready writer. The reader will discover in every part the presence of great care, but this care always combined with the most perfect freedom. You never behold signs of labor on the part of the author when seeking to express an idea or shade of idea, but all seems to flow forth, as by an inward spontaneity, from the author's own consciousness. It springs up like a fountain, and only labors when it is sought, by outward circumstances, to keep it down. The power *over* words and the power *of* words are both finely illustrated in the peculiar style, limpid and musical, which runs through the whole book. The thought is always nicely conceived, logically embodied and beautifully expressed; and not unfrequently is the reader delighted with strokes of real eloquence and genuine pathos. It abounds also with apt and many rare quotations of poetry, especially where the desire seems to be to throw sunbeams of light and joy into minds filled with darkness and sorrow in consequence of providential affliction. The author speaks to the afflicted not only as one who has himself experienced the deep throes of grief at parting from loved ones, but also as one who has clearly apprehended the true source of comfort and hope, with peculiar power to exhibit it to others. In this view the book here offered to the public will be highly prized by many.

The book is varied as to contents. In itself it may be called a *library* on the subject of Home. It dwells, to a greater or less extent, upon almost every conceivable feature connected

with the Family Relation; and yet it is not by any means superficial or trite at any point. The whole subject, under its general aspect, being clearly conceived and stated in the beginning, it required afterwards often but a few words to exhibit the details in their most profound relations: and yet all this is done with a most engaging and popular manner. In this will consist the charm of this work for all classes of mind and for all degrees of education—from the lowest upward.

But the chief merits of the book, after all, lie in its true conceptions of Home, as the natural, and in a certain sense also, as the Spiritual source of our being. Home is neither an actual play-house, nor an unsubstantial picture, but a real fountain of real being, opened by the divine hand itself. It is not only the real channel through which we derive our personal existence, but it is also the continuous and divinely ordained power by which this personal existence is affected and moulded, and thus conditioned to reach either its true glory or its lasting shame. It is truly organic, not only as to its conception or being as a whole, but also as to the operation of all its specific forces, physical, mental and moral through all the parts of which it is composed. As it is divine already in the form of nature, it looks to Christianity by a necessary inherent gaze, as the only sphere in which it can properly actualize its true form and complete its true life. Here it becomes a real and vital part of the Christian Church, in which natural relations, involving natural affections and duties, become the basis of spiritual relations, involving spiritual affections and duties. This is not a *double home*, but a single house in its true two-fold relation, first to the world of nature, and second to the world of spirit—first to time, and second to eternity. It is the latter that gives substance, stability and dignity to the former.

From this stand-point the author is at once enabled to take a true view of parents, their duties, cares and responsibilities in their relation to each other and the children in whom they became united as one flesh, as also the relation of children to their parents and each other, and the duties growing out of these relations.

In this view of the case, which is indeed the only true Scriptural view, it is quite easy to perceive that it is a very different thing to be born in a Christian family from being born in one which is not Christian. The basis of Holy Baptism in the first

is laid already in the natural constitution of the child; and it is upon this substantial natural ground (a ground nevertheless, laid by the wisdom and power and grace of God) that the promise is founded, "I will be a God to thee and thy seed after thee in their generations." Here the holy ordinance of Baptism assumes its true and high character; and the manner in which the author brings out this part of his general subject is truly refreshing when contrasted with the low and meaningless views which prevail so extensively in regard to this sacred and divine institution.

But we should have to extend this notice far beyond our present design to express the full bearings of this timely work on the Christian Home. We therefore close by cordially recommending it to every family. It is just the book which every parent should read and study, and then place it in the hands of his sons and daughters. In this event, we have no doubt but that Home, in many cases, would assume a very different complexion from what it now wears. The home feeling would soon show itself as the first fruit with promise; sacred home memories would be sacredly cherished; the names of father and mother—always significant and tender—would carry with them the sound of a still deeper, richer melody; and every link in the golden chain that binds happy hearts would exhibit to the sight of each the divine mould in which it was formed and the exceeding preciousness of the material of which it is composed. The book is happily adapted to every emergency of life whether on the part of parents or children, separated or united. Its suggestions and reasonings will be found especially useful to children in the great turning point of life, in the choice of a companion, in the selection on an occupation, or in regard to any interest that may have power to affect the true well-being of children, both for time and eternity.

Thanking the worthy author for the pleasure and profit which we ourselves have derived from a perusal of this volume, we would heartily recommend it to all others whose eyes may fall upon this brief and very imperfect notice.

D. G.

ERRATUM.

In January number for this year, page 64, 14th line from bottom of page, for *chosen twelve*, read *evangelists*.

